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Reviewer's report:

As written this paper seems more relevant to social scientists than an environmental health audience. I think revisions are needed to make it suitable for this journal. A primary issue with this paper is that I wasn't sure why this research is needed, nor of the research question(s)/hypothesis. These should be made clearer/stated explicitly. It seems to me that the paper completes research and analysis about how and why an environmental health effort at the intersection of research and policy was and was not successful towards its intended goal, which is certainly of interest to an environmental health audience - but the results, discussion and conclusion need to elucidate these connections.

Additionally, to make the findings relevant for an environmental health audience, the paper should do one or more of the following:

1. Discuss the implications of the findings for environmental breast cancer research and policy
2. Based on the findings, make recommendations for how future reports or laws similar to IBCERCC could be made more impactful
3. Advisory committees composed of diverse stakeholders are common in environmental health contexts- are there more general implications of these findings for such committees? If so, what are they and what are the next steps/recommendations?

Other minor issues which should be addressed:

1. The importance and context of the IBCERCC report is not framed in the background section- some of the information in "The 2008 Law and IBCERCC Report" should probably be in the background.
2. I found some of the reference formatting confusing, with numbers used at first occurrence in the text, but in later instances sometimes referred to by author (year). Because the reference
list is numbered and not alphabetical, this made the author (year) references difficult to locate.

3. There are a number of typo kind of errors, including but not limited to lines: 400, 415, 432, 533, 580, 606, 611, 622
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