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Author’s response to reviews:

Thanks for the decision; we've made the following corrections/edits:

1. The material that came through did not appear to include the Box mentioned on p.18; ## typo corrected, should read ‘figure 3’.

2. The title of reference 44 does not seem quite right; ## amended

3. Reference 62 seems to be duplicated as reference 71. ## amended

So, the paper could very appropriately be published after these points have been addressed.

There are a couple of further observations that the authors could take note of if they wished to do so:

1. A paper in our journal earlier this year provided ‘a systematic rapid evidence assessment focused on the research question: do economies of scale and scope exist in biomedical and health research?’ While the review suggested ‘The absence of predominant findings for or against the existence of economies of scale or scope’, some of the issues may be relevant for
the research proposed in the protocol:  http://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12961-016-0167-3  ## We’ve referred to this paper briefly on page 5.

2. Three closely related theoretical frameworks are described, and it is of course fine that the hybrid approach mentioned on p.25 will be explored further in a separate publication. I did wonder, however, if some slightly fuller explanation might be helpful of the strengths, or aspects, of at least some Mode 1 knowledge production that means it remains a widely used approach in biomedical research, and linked to that some clarification of whose research agenda it is thought is being ‘distorted’ by commercial and other powerful interests?  ## Agree, clarified briefly on page 25.