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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor-in-chief,

Thank you very much for your feedback. We have tried to respond to and implement the reviewer’s comments in the paper. However, Steven Wooding’s opinions have had a major impact on our paper; therefore we’d like to include him as one of the authors. We would like to re-state that the reason this paper will be useful is that there are large volumes of materials available on the issue, but that this paper is an acceptable summary of such material and may prove helpful to interested readers.

In response to Steven Wooding’s comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1- Certain changes were made in the paragraph to clarify the subject and modify the text (page 13 paragraph 2).
2- The changes were applied to the text (page 3 paragraph 1 and page 4 paragraph 4).
3- The aim of our study was to identify existent methods and measurable outcomes in health research economic evaluations, and not to appraise conducted studies and factors such as not taking lag time into account or considering multiple presumptions of the study’s flaws, not methodology flaws. As we see these shortcomings are not seen in the UK study either.
4- As advised by the reviewer, certain modifications were made to clarify the subject (page 11 paragraph 3).
5- As advised by the reviewer, certain modifications were made to clarify the subject (page 13 paragraph 2).

Essential Minor Revisions:

1- According to reference 23, this framework was designed by Kuruvilla S et al. However; they have not presented practical indicators for the domains introduced.
2- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (page 9 paragraph...
2 line 3 ).
3- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (page 9 paragraph 3 ).
4- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (page 10 paragraph 1 ).
5- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (page 10 paragraph 2 ).
Discretionary Revisions:
1- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments.
2- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (page 12 paragraph 1 line 2 ).
In response to Elizabeth Kalucy’s comments:
Essential Minor Revisions:
1- Changes were made in line with the reviewer’s comments (reference 19).
Discretionary Revisions:
1- Modifications relevant to the article’s written quality were implemented.