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Reviewers’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to complete a review for the manuscript HRPS-D-17-00191 titled, "Measuring Research Impact in Medical Research Institutes: A qualitative study of the attitudes and opinions of Australian medical research institutes towards research impact assessment frameworks". I would suggest the following revisions:

In the introduction

1. Line 106-109 "For disciplines outside of HMR and different institutional environments, the focus upon MRIs provides a clearer focus upon research translation and impact by excluding the teaching responsibilities of universities and/or the challenges facing research fields for which translation outcomes may carry less relevance". This is a loaded sentence, please consider splitting into two.

2. Line 119-121 and Line 1069 "Subsequent research will draw the implications from the results of this qualitative research and the prior study to inform upon guiding principles for a RIAF tailored to Australia's MRI sector" - check this sentence, as above.

In the methods

3. Abbreviations such as e.g. and i.e. are suitable for technical reports, bit not peer-reviewed articles

4. Sample selection requires clarification. Perhaps consider adding a sentence "As a result of the purposeful sampling, 15 institutes out of 46 were approached to participate"

5. Table 1: sum of % by state does not add up to 100.

6. Line 165-170. Can you clarify who are these "five participating stakeholders", and "other stakeholders" identified via network sampling? Is this an extra sample with different sampling process (network sampling)?
7. Can you add the number of participants from ARC and NHMRC in brackets (n=…)

8. Line 176 "All interviews were conducted by teleconference, which provided for the collection of supporting field notes". Did you imply if interviews were to be conducted face-to-face, they won't allow collection of supporting field notes?

9. Line 207. Can you describe how the "the framework method" was applied in this research?

10. Line 211 "thematic framework corresponding to this a priori comprehension was utilised" - repetition

In the discussion

11. Line 1033 "A second overarching issue relates to the fundamental purpose of RIA, given the objective holds implications for the form and method of assessment" - consider giving more details on the implications for the form and method of assessment

12. Line 1056-1057 "The research found that participants did not initially comprehend the idea with impact assessment implicitly assumed to be retrospective" Can you make it a positive statement, by simply saying impact assessment was typically regarded as retrospective

13. Line 1047 define RAND - an American non-profit global policy think tank "Research ANd Development"


15. Line 1066-1067 It is not appropriate to have one sentence as a paragraph, consider merging with the above or below paragraphs.

16. Can you provide a few sentences, whether the framework (RIAF) can be used by individual researchers/teams working in medical field but not affiliated with MRIs? How versatile this framework?

Despite all of this, I think this is a good research report and adds important knowledge. Should authors complete suggestions listed above, the manuscript findings will offer greater meaning.
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