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Reviewer's report:

Overall, I found this paper to be unique and it provides an interesting framework for examining Health in all Policies work. I appreciate the complexity of the material presented and commend the authors on their work. A few thoughts to consider:

* The article could greatly benefit from ensuring that the messages are more clear and concise. I am familiar with HiAP work but much less familiar with systems theory and therefore found the article to be full of jargon that made it difficult to understand the key points. In particular the first two sections in the paper (introduction, systems theory and critical realism) could use more plain talk principles.

* The use of italics at the beginning of the paper does not come with a clear explanation. In the case study portion it is noted that italics highlight the system components but I did not see any reasoning for the use of this in the earlier sections.

* The sentence beginning on line 232 ("In turn...") does not seem like a natural thought progression leading from the previous sentence. Would suggest either adding in a line to tie the thoughts together or remove lines 233-237.

* Similarly, at line 265 I think there needs to be a connecting line that better explains the use of the case study as an example of the application of HIAs in decision-making.

* I am missing the "so what" piece at the end of the paper. What are the key take-away points and how can people learn and improve their HiAP work from applying this framework? Although it is useful to retrospectively apply this framework and understand how all of the components interacted in the implementation process, is there a way that the information learned can be applied in a meaningful way in future projects?
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