Response to reviewer-1 and 2

I agree and appreciate the Reviewer's comment.

Removed the word empirical in title and included type of study in both the Introduction and Methods.

Authors appreciated the comment and included additional statistical analyses to account for variables that may affect the measures of effect.

INCLUDED ADDITIONAL STATISTICAL ANALYSES TO ACCOUNT FOR VARIABLES THAT MAY AFFECT THE MEASURES OF EFFECT.

SPECIFIC STUDY DESIGN NOW INCLDUED IN INTRODUCTION AND METHODS.

NOW INCLUDED IN METHODS AND RESULTS

WE INCLUDED SEVERAL MAJOR COMMONLY USED OUTCOMES IN OUR STUDY AND ALSO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THERE ARE OTHER POSSIBLE OUTCOMES IN THE STUDY LIMITATIONS.

WE NOW INCLUDE ADDRESSING ADDITIONAL VARIABLES IN OUR DATA ANALYSES.

WE NOW SPECIFY INCLDUING ALL ACCREDITED AND ALL NON-ACCREDITED LPHA DEPARTMENTS. THERE IS NO DEPARTMENT NOT INCLUDED.

APPRECIATE THE REVIEWER COMMENT. WE NOW PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO ADRRESS THIS LEGITIMATE CONCERN.

NOW THERE IS NO SAMPLE SIZE ISSUE, WE NOW INCLUDE THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF ACCREDITED AND NON-ACCREDITED COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENTS.

Response to reviewer-3

Authors appreciate the comment. Authors removed the word empirical from title and introduction. Authors also specified the type of study in the Introduction and Methods and it was a comparison of between accredited and non-accredited LPHA's and select population health outcomes.

Authors now specify including ALL accredited and non-accredited LPHA's

POSSILBY YES BUT THIS STUDY INCLUDES ALL LPHA'S WHERE THE DAY TO DAY SERVICES ARE FOCUSED. DAVE, IS THERE EVEN STATE CERTIFICATION?
AUTHORS INCLDUDE THIS AS A RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE STUDIES

AUTHORS CONCUR WITH THIS REVIEWER COMMENT AND HAVE EXPANDED DISCUSSION OF LIMITATION. LIMITATION

AUTHORS ACKNOWLEGE NO FUNDING. BOTH AUTHORS ARE FROM ACADEMIA AND HAVE NO AFFILIATION WITH ANY POTENTIAL ACCRDITATION BIASES.