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Reviewer’s report:

1. Does it address an important or timely issue?
   1.1 Yes - well argued in the background and discussion sections.

2. Is it well reasoned?
   2.1 Yes - to improve the clarity I would suggest moving the third sentence in the Abstract section "This commentary describes…” and making it the opening sentence.

   2.2 In the Abstract I would retain statement that "…an independent evaluation is underway ."

3. Is it relatively balanced, or does it make plain where the author's opinions might not represent the field as a whole?
   3.1 It is clearer now this is an internal assessment rather than a critical analysis.

4. Is the standard of writing acceptable?
   4.1 It is generally well written. In places it would benefit perhaps, from editing by a native English speaking editor.

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

   None remaining.

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

   6.1 In title change spelling to "Fulfilment…”

   6.2 Background
   
   Figure 1 - I think this should be labelled as a table or redrawn as a Table.

   6.3 Obstacles in the implementation process
   
   Second para. second sentence change to "Sometimes…”
6.4 References
Please note in the reference [9] change to "...research priority..."

6.5 Figures and Tables

These need to be carefully labelled and cross referenced with the text depending on the decision to revise Figure 1 to a table (see above). Labelling of existing figures 3 and 4 need to change as there is no Figure 2.

7. Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

7.1 I understand the authors feel this is a commentary paper rather than research. However, I feel the paper would still benefit from a section that described the approach the authors took to reach the conclusions they did i.e. akin to a methods section but leave this to their discretion.

7.2 Discussion

As the authors point out this process started a long time before the recent paper on good practice. I think this is a valuable point they should make in the paper itself e.g.

"Although Brazil began the design and implementation of the National Agenda of Priorities in Health Research in 2003 it has done so in accordance with the 'good practice' principles recently published [9]."
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