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**Reviewer's report:**

The article is a review addressing the important issue of evaluating the economic impact of healthcare research. The article is not particularly well reasoned. By the end of the article, I was unsure whether the authors were advocating for a macroeconomic approach to a body of research work, a case study approach where researchers specified the possible economic impact of their work and how this should be measured (which is unrealistic given the non-linear pathways by which an individual research project may or may not achieve impact), methods of evaluating the cost effectiveness of interventions as in the WHO CHOICE project, or maybe all of the above in different circumstances. The authors are seeking standardised methodological tools at the international level to assess economic impact of health care research in specific settings, but this article does not make it clear what components would best be included in these standardised tools.

The article is relatively balanced, without obviously making it plain where the author's opinions might not represent the field as a whole.

The written English is much improved.

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**
  The author has responded satisfactorily to the 9 major compulsory revisions suggested by this reviewer, most of which related to expression of meaning.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**
  The author has not corrected Reference 19 (previously 20).
  It should read:

  Kalucy L, Jackson-Bowers E, McIntyre E, Hordacre A-L, Reed R. Exploring the impact of primary health care research. Primary Health Care Research and Information Service; 2009

- **Discretionary Revisions**
  The author has addressed the suggestions made.

The authors have responded to the suggestions made by this reviewer, and the article is now much easier to read and understand. However, I’m not convinced how much value the article adds to the field, beyond describing the methods
used to assess economic impact of healthcare research. I think the decision to accept or reject will depend on the re-review by the other reviewer who had more substantial concerns about the article. I have not considered in any detail the extent to which the authors have addressed his concerns.

This article is of some interest to those with closely related research interests,

The quality of written English is greatly improved in the revised manuscript, and is now acceptable with a few corrections. However, there are still a few minor errors as follows:

P 10, para 2, line 5 – should read.....has been employed more than any other model.
P 11 final paragraph line 1: missing word after ‘evaluation’
P 11 Final paragraph line 4: sentence should read ‘In some cases, data from other related or unrelated health care sectors......
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