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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is an interesting paper reporting on the rationale and protocol for research impact assessment. Minor comments for consideration by the authors below:

**BACKGROUND**

1) It would be useful in the background to provide further information and rationale for the use of the FAIT framework. For example, who developed the framework? What evidence is there to support it? How has it been used previously, has it been used in child obesity space previously?

2) Sentence commencing on line 97 is 6 lines long - this needs to be shortened to improve readability.

**METHODS**

3) Data collection - it is unclear what interview data will be collected (overview of the interview topics to be covered would be helpful here) and why health economists will collect interview data.

4) Literature reviews - please provide justification for why the quality of the studies will not be assessed in the scooping reviews.

5) Quantified metrics - it is unclear why the quantified metrics will be based on interviews with researchers only and not researchers and end users? Line 217-218 (page 9). It is likely that researchers may over-report or over-estimate benefits given their vested interest in the research program outcomes compared to end users. This needs to be acknowledged as a potential limitation.

6) Economic assessment - it is unclear in the economic assessment why 'expected' impact is being assessed rather than the 'actual' impact. Given this is a retrospective analysis, shouldn't the actual impact be known (in the short term at least?) given the formal funding for the research ended 7 years ago? Please clarify.
DISCUSSION

The discussion should include an acknowledgement of the strengths and weakness of the proposed study and a clearer sense of how this study will contribute to the literature in the area of research translation (ie what gaps does it address, how does it add to previous studies).
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