Reviewer-1

Overall Comments:
Abstract – Was very clear and precise, but could change wording such as "no statistically significant difference exists" to "no significant differences were observed" to improve better understanding of the message. The author could also add some points noted in the implications of the findings.

Introduction – The author did a good job identifying the gap the study aims to address. However, they could have also provided alternative quality assurance or quality improvement models in comparism to accreditation options.

Methods – A concise and detailed explanation of how the random matching methodology ensured equal balance based on demographic, social and economic factors. The author could provide more understanding on how selection bias was avoided when selecting accredited vs non-accredited LPHAs. The author could also provide more knowledge about the impact of the highlighted limitation on the overall study findings.

Results – Clearly explained and presented. More information on how certain p-values where highlighted ass significant over some other.

Discussions – the concept of opportunity cost is very tangible but could be better understood with some good examples or illustrations of other existing alternatives that are valuable and productive.
Conclusion – the idea around future research is great but could do well with identifying more indepth alternative frameworks or strategies that can be studied i.e. through a pilot or longitudinal approach.

Suggestion for improvement – The author could also highlight situations where the accreditation model has been successful and study what made it work. There could also highlight the possibility of doing a feedback study approach to identify possible failures