Reviewer-3

Accreditation has good intent, but does it work, is it worth it, does it make a difference?

Question the word choice “empirical” which implies observation. The study wasn’t based on observation. Study design wasn’t mentioned. Perhaps the author could make it more clear in the title that this study was a comparison between accredited and non-accredited LPHA’s and select population health outcomes.

Appropriate sections. Unclear how LPHA’s were matched. Better information needed on methodology and impacts on outcomes.

Very interesting and timely article. I suggest major revisions to highlight and include the questions and suggestions below in order to clarify the specific research methods used and to increase credibility and applicability for practical use in public health. Questions about, or suggested improvements to, the manuscript: Very interesting, timely, and applicable article. I suggest major revisions to highlight and include the questions and suggestions below. What was the process to “match” LPHA’s? This was not clearly articulated. Please define “key demographic, social, and economic” indicators. Is there a benefit to also comparing state outcomes? Follow-up study utilizing different health outcome measures? Discussion section – include discussion of limitations. Any funding or author biases that need to be mentioned?