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Reviewer's report:

1. Overall comments
The authors have taken time and care to address comments from the previous review phase and have made the paper stronger, more clear and more informative. I have some minor comments which I list below:

Introduction: SAGE - a new measure of research engagement actions

2. Para 3
3rd line - The majority of SAGE data ARE . . . ' not IS - data are plural

3. Last line - suggest reordering final line to place interviewing before analysis since this is the order undertaken in research, to read ' ...experience in qualitative interviewing and analysis'

4. Question: what part does the qualitative interview data obtained in interviews play in the assessment of research engagement? After being introduced in this section, it is not mentioned again during the paper. Could the authors add a sentence explaining its role in relation to the scoring system?

Method: Defining the subactions and levels

5. 1st para
8th line - 'examples of each research engagement action WAS identified'. Not WERE

Discussion: Advantages of the SAGE scoring system and implications for evidence-informed policymaking

6. 2nd para - parts of speech need amending to clarify. Amended version is below with capitals showing changes. Starts line 5
'
...evaluate the extent to which staff currently interact (no plural) with researchers to inform policy development. They WOULD find, however, that they WOULD score very low.....'

Starts line 10
'Consequently, the organisations COULD decide (no plural) to invest...'

Starts line 13
'... The organisation COULD then administer (no plural) SAGE to evaluate...'
Line 15. Before sentence 'Improvements in policymakers’ interactions...' add EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT improvements in policymakers'...

Conclusion
7. Penultimate line, change WILL to COULD
'which COULD ultimately lead to improvements in the development of evidence-informed policies.'

8. Table 1: Definitions of Key Terms
This is good. The column providing an example is a great help in understanding how the terms are used.

The authors have answered the points I raised in my previous review. My recommendation is to accept after minor essential revisions.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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