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Reviewer's report:

I read the revised paper with interest. I welcome the revisions made by the authors to clarify the scope of the work, and to specify the ways they have built on previous frameworks. In my view, the paper’s contribution is now much clearer.

I have only a few remaining minor comments:

Discretionary revisions:

Abstract: I wonder if the first sentence could be more precisely specified. The scope of public policies is very broad indeed. Is the goal of STI programs not more specific?

My page 8, replace "their" with "its": "The NIH catch phrase, "bench to bedside" is an explicit statement of such a supply push orientation where scientific activity is a given so a focus on their[its] application is a fait accompli."

My page 14, top - "were" rather than "where": "(personal communication with Dr Ian Graham). At that time, these downstream knowledge applications where[were] genetically represented ..."

My page 16, "contend" not "content": "The authors content[contend] that government programs intending to generate ..."

My page 17 - sentence in need of a verb: "A constant trade-off in a fast-paced world besieged by interests competing for attention."
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