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Reviewer's report:

General

While I was initially concerned about the paper length I found it very clearly written and easy to follow. I think the paper makes a strong and useful contribution to the issues of assessing research impact, is well researched and carefully referenced and is valuable to thinking in diverse health fields and in multiple methodologies. I wondered if the writers might consider the work of the Canadian group CHSRF considering the research / policy interface?

The main table of the Framework itself might benefit from a more ‘snazzy’ colour layout with the graphics taken through the description of the components to aid the readers orientation ~ as the paper is quite lengthy?.

There are a few very minor typos:

P 7 should insert “on” before “policy”? 
Table 1, item, 1.4 should be a full stop no a comma
Pg 14 small r after eg?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this pragmatic and useful paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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