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Reviewer’s report:

This is an important and much needed piece. Your methods have been appropriate and rigorous, and surprisingly this is exactly where I find a fairly significant problem with your argument.

I acknowledge that the research has been undertaken from an English speaking and Anglosaxon foundation, and this means that the selection and inclusion criteria (understandably!) have been framed from that vantage point. I feel that should be recognised more strongly, and beyond that, I would suggest you need to spend at least one or two paragraphs on discussing the European concept of 'valorisation' (Google "valorisation europe academic" and you will see what I mean - the notion of 'valorisation' is gaining significant traction in EU research funding and dissemination).

You seem to fall into the trap that you describe yourself in the entire argument about fuzzy definitions where you seem to have missed a body of conceptualisations that claims to address your issues. I see how you could easily argue that 'valorisation' is not the same as 'research impact' (let alone 'policy impact') and suggest that by embracing your own findings beyond the English/Anglosaxon would add 'referencebility' and usability to your piece!
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