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Reviewer's report:

This is a nice work in which the authors address one burning issue in the field of funding research as an operational strategy to implement changes in a number of public social activities. The approach is sound and of particularly high value as it comes from the experience of the ISRIA where a large number of well recognized experts meet regularly to become a world-wide think tank for RIA. The benchmarking work is of high value and the guidelines proposed by the authors reflect a deep intelectual analysis of the different bottlenecks that are present in the process of measuring the impact of public policies. I just have to minor suggestions that the authors may address and that would improve the manuscript

1. Benchmarking with the impact assessment policies in the H2020 calls (particularly in the field of Heath Research) should be addressed. The EU is a major funder in biomedical research in Europe and without that comparision the manuscript won’t be round

2. It would be nice if the authors develop a little bit more in detail the problems existing behind the formulation of specific indicators for measuring impact. This is a critical issue as the way a specific indicator is developed would determine its capacity to measure the intensity of the event.
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