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Reviewer's report:

This argument is important. It is not clear exactly to whom it is directed. Further there is insufficient analysis of existing attempts to convert these ideas into policy.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?

Yes. There is no doubt that this is an important issue.

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?

It is well argued but as stated above insufficient reference to existing similar commentry.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

The figures may be genuine but there is no justification of that particular logic model - what alternatives did they consider / what else exists?

5. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?

Yes - but there is not enough inoculation against counter argument - why might some people against this - and how should that be overcome.

6. Is the piece written well enough for publication? (nb. Since we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing poorly written manuscript. If you tell us that the writing is not acceptable for publication, we will ask the authors to find someone, or an editing service, to help them rewrite it. If you tell us that the manuscript is too poorly written for it to be peer reviewed, we will ask them to rewrite it now.)