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Author’s response to reviews:

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for your insightful comments and the opportunity to provide additional clarifications and revisions to this manuscript. Your comments have helped to sharpen our revisions and have made this manuscript stronger. Please find a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments.

Sincerely,

Tamara L. McCarron
Reviewer #1

General

I cannot find where the term "investment" is defined and explained in the new manuscript version (not "L131-L135" nor "L237-L240" as indicated to Reviewer #2).

Response: I have highlighted the section in the paper (in the track changes version) which defines investment. Please see Lines 131-135.

Information sources and search strategy.

L167: Section now starts with a phrase stating "with this understanding in mind": would need rephrasing for clarity.

Response:

With this understanding in mind, is now mentioned on L138 in the clean copy. This sentence has been modified to now say:

Search terms were debated with this enhanced understanding of investment in mind and the project team created an exhaustive and wide-reaching list of search terms to adequately describe possible methods used by health systems to invest in patients.

Thank you for this very insightful suggestion!

Data Synthesis

L262: After "See Appendix 1", place information regarding data synthesis under a separate header.
Response: Now on L206, After Appendix 1, I have put the following text into a new section titled “Data Synthesis.”

L263: Explain what "a modified constant comparative method developed by Glaser" entails.

Response: Now on L207, I added a few words to clarify what we did. The sentence now says:

This method required that the research team place each study into a theme; comparing each new study to the previous to determine if there was a new theme.

L263-265: Are "investment themes" and "investment categories" to be understood as being the same parameter? If not please clarify.

Response: Now on L209-210, this section was updated for consistency. The word categories should not have been introduced into this section. All investments were themed. This now reads:

This process was repeated until all studies were placed into a unique theme.

Quality assessment

L287: If 4 studies were not relevant, not assessed, and not included in results, they were excluded from the review.

Response: Since this is a scoping review, removal of the studies is not required as the purpose of the review is to map out existing literature. That said, I appreciate the reviewer’s comments and have made additional modifications. I hope this addresses the comment.
In the methods section, L192-193 I added: Studies were not excluded based on quality.

Then in the results section, L236-237.

"Four studies did not meet the initial screening questions and were not further assessed. Since we did not exclude based on quality, studies not meeting the initial screening questions were not included in the presentation of outcomes."

Reviewer #2

Thank you for your efforts in modifying the paper.

Response: Thank you for your comments.