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Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The review evaluates frameworks designed to create and embed research capacity in the allied health. The paper identifies and synthesizes 16 theoretical frameworks that could inform the development of models to embed a culture of allied health research in healthcare settings. Overall, the review provides a useful contribution to knowledge in this important area and is a reflection of considerable work from the authors. I have however included some suggestions to strengthen the paper and increase its clarity to readers.

Title: Consider identifying the paper as a rapid review in the title.
Abstract: You state in the background of the abstract that this is a systematic review but then in the methods- a rapid review, please reword to keep consistent.
Background:
Line 48 p1 introduction- You could use more updated references to support this statement about reduced research skills in AH. There has been a great body of research evaluating research capacity and skills of AH clinicians in the last 5-10 years.
Line 15, p2 of intro-
The connection of ideas between earlier sentences in this paragraph (i.e., need for health policy and program design informed by research evidence) and the final sentence of the need for research capacity building of clinicians so they can undertake research could be made clearer. I think it would be useful to include a connecting sentence here.

P7, line 1-you state published worldwide literature but then also include unpublished literature in the review- may want to modify this sentence.
P7, line 3 "As the basis for developing a new policy framework … in the health sector."
Is it the health sector or allied health you are interested in?
P7, line 22 There seems to be a number of concepts this review is trying to focus on… Could you reword this paragraph by stating what the primary and secondary focuses are? It seems the focus of the paper is diffused by the many different foci you are trying to include. This could then flow better with your aims.

Methods:
What was the justification for only looking at one Australian government library service catalogue when other Australian government service reports may also be available?
As per PRISMA guidelines- include the dates when you conducted the searches.
As per PRISMA guidelines provide at least one full search strategy for one of the databases you used (perhaps as an appendix or supplementary file) so that the search could be repeated.
Line 33 p 10- can you define more objectively what you mean by "clearly irrelevant", i.e., didn't meet the search eligibility criteria?
Line 52, page 10- see typo
"Method quality appraisal was t conducted when there was a validated instrument for the…"
P 10, line 48- typo
(ii) the formation themes through overarching similarities and connections
Results
P 11, line 28- consider rewording the term "cull" as this word may evoke other connotations.
P11 line 38 "…and the final included frameworks reflected this tradition." It is unclear what you mean by the last phrase of this sentence, as it does not appear to add any meaning I would consider deleting.
I would consider Table 2 as an appendix or supplementary file rather than in main text.
There is a lot of redundancy between Tables 1 and 3 can you merge them together as one table? I would also consider including more detail in the tables about the included studies themselves rather than the reference (which is already in the reference list), for example, the location of the study, design, type/profession of participants (if any), type of study (e.g., qualitative, review etc.) as columns.
See typo p15, line 15 "responsibly" and line 22 "dedicated assigning"
The first sentence under "Theme 4" doesn't seem to directly relate to attributes of individual clinicians but probably fits better with earlier themes. To clarify, perhaps you could have an opening sentence under theme 4 which summarises the theme and then in the rest of the paragraph describe it in more detail.

Is there any way you can make Table 4 more visually appealing—perhaps as a figure? Is there any conceptual relationship/interplay between these themes?

The third aim of your study was to summarise the strength and weaknesses of each framework. You have outlined this in the text, in particular for five papers however state that you could not apply the MMAT due to lack of reported data. Was this the case for all the studies? You state that "The ORACLE Framework was derived by robust mixed methods that included qualitative methods for face validity and quantitative methods for scoring a matrix". How did you come to the conclusion that this used robust mixed methods? You may need more detail in this section to objectify these statements. Particular as your research question is around identifying how "robust" the frameworks are.

Discussion

It would be useful to have an opening summary statement of your main findings to open the discussion, linking to your original aims/research question.

You state in the discussion that "Some of the included frameworks did not demonstrate robust development methods…” this implies that some did have robust development methods, however as per my earlier comment there was limited objective appraisal of risk of bias of the frameworks.

In your conclusion you state "public and private hospitals" as your setting. As the findings could be used more widely (i.e., community health settings, outpatient clinics), it may be better to keep more broad language e.g., public and private healthcare services. You would also need to consider revising in the abstract.

References:
Make sure you use the correct referencing style for your websites. See reference 3 which is just a website link.
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