

Response to Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer Comment – 1

Reviewer 1 noted, “I think the ending pieces on race and on public health school education, although important would be better addressed as separate papers. Adding them on in the end distracts from the main theme of the paper. It would require an analysis of all the statewide data based on race and a whole other discourse about how schools of public health are failing to adequately address public advocacy and policy (which I agree with!)”

We have removed those sections in the later part of the Discussion section and the related references, renumbering the references accordingly. Thank you for the insight.

Reviewer Comment – 2

No changes were indicated by Reviewer 2. Comments were offered in support of the article and its publication. The authors appreciate the comments and the support.

Reviewer Comment – 3

Reviewer 3 chose to track changes in the manuscript and offer suggestions in that format. All changes submitted by Reviewer 3 were accepted. The authors appreciate the feedback and agree that the re-wording was appropriate and helped to strengthen the article.

Reviewer 3, Comment 1 (within text): Page 3, “How economic conditions matter to the health status of populations received thorough analysis by Venkataramani et al. (2020).”

Reviewer noted: “Clarify this sentence.” – We reviewed the sentence. The sentence was written to preface the subsequent sentence and serve as a bridge to the literature offered by those authors noted. However, it was re-worded slightly with some words removed to make it more clear.

Reviewer 3, Comment 2 (within text): “Not sure if this phrase is necessary, or enhances the meaning of the rest of the sentence.” – We reviewed the sentence and deleted it.

Reviewer 3, Comment 3 (within text): Page 5, “...offering more or less check-off boxes evaluating the presence or absence of variables...”

Reviewer noted: “Clarify this statement.” – We reviewed the sentence and re-worded it some to make it more clear.