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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very nice review of value frameworks. The authors seek to understand and categorize "value frameworks" based on a number of pre-specified criteria.

Overall, I would say that this is a useful review, but perhaps not as deep or insightful as one might like.

1. The notion of value is problematic. Value is a term that comes from economics, but many of these frameworks are not primarily economic in nature. For each framework, would try to identify the specific construct that the framework is getting at...even when there are multiple criteria, developers are usually trying to get at something (best decision? efficiency? what)

2. Thus, many of these frameworks are in fact, "decision frameworks", rather than value frameworks, I would argue. If one takes a sufficiently expansive definition of value, this can of course cover a lot of territory. But I'd argue that this is potentially misleading because it causes us to adopt an economic lens with which to view the problem of how best to make a decision.

3. I'd indicate the theoretical foundation, if any, used by each framework. In some cases (CEA) is will usually be obvious. In other cases, not really so easy to identify. Absence of a theoretical foundation is important, and should be reported.

4. It seems that the authors conflate types of frameworks (e.g. CEA, MCDA) with specific instantiations thereof. I would argue that the ICER framework, for example, is an MCDA framework without weights. A better approach I would have thought would have been to come up with a typology of frameworks, then list specific examples of those types.

5. Process and context are key components of frameworks.

=WHO uses the framework, and for what purpose....important

=HOW is the framework implemented....e.g. who generates, who reviews, and who presents the evidence. How are decisions achieved...is there a consensus process, voting etc.
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