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Reviewer's report:

About the "methods", corresponding author mentioned the choice of a "narrative literature review". Need explanation about its adequacy over a systematic review.

One overall comment: author speaks about the independency of AETMIS. From the examined programs/technologies, all requests seem to have been submitted by the Quebec Dept. of Health. Need more explain about the term 'independency'

Sometimes manuscript cites "actors", sometimes "stakeholders". Although actors or stakeholders may seem identical, p. 20 explain why the use of the terms stakeholders over actors seem more appropriate. Such mention should be done right at the beginning of the paper. After which, either "actors" should be used.

P. 3, the use of the expression "programmes" (2nd line of 'background") would gain to be changed for "systems". Same par.: mention into parentheses should cite not only the ref. but also from which page it came from...

P. 4: Examples of dominant models should be cited. Also, types of AETMIS are mentioned the possibility that they may be different from other agencies. How much differently?

P. 5 - about the examined dimensions: would have been interesting to mention here the ELSIs. They seem overlooked right from the start.

p. 9 - 2nd par., last sentence: the term 'development' should be used instead of "realisations".

P. 13- mid 3rd par.: mention of a network. But which network?

P. 18 - last par. Who are the key stakeholders (most concerned vs. those directly involved.

P. 20, 2nd par. : actors are separated into two categories. Which are they?

p. 23 - 1st par. The expression "discipline" does not look right. HTA is not a discipline per se, a discipline being a very particular branch of science knowledge (e.g., sociology, epidemiology, etc.). People may have expertise in the field, because of their own training. HTA is an interdisciplinary domain of action (Decker 2001), a multi-disciplinary field of action (Bassitsta, 1996).
Would be interesting here to give more explanation about the societal perspective of HTA. If social/political/ethical issues are so much important, those are excluded for the examined characteristics mentioned in Table 1. Paper would gain consistency in being more explicit about the social process of HTA vs the social preferences (see O'Donnell 2009 and Lehoux 2007).

About table 1: would be interesting to mention the timeframe of activity (from the receipt of request up to the first dissemination strategy. About the case "types of issues", there are not references to any ELSI concerns. That may explain that evidence-based medicine seems to prevail as "scientific evidence"...

Overall, not sure that the experience of AETMIS may be replicated with other HTA agencies. Title should mention that AETMIS may correspond to the "exploratory case study".

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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