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Reviewer's report:

In this "debate" manuscript, the authors present a compelling argument for the application of qualitative methods in support of economic evaluation for implementation science. To maximize the contributions of economic evaluations to implementation science, they recommend that researchers take advantage of mixed methods approaches. The authors present a taxonomy of mixed methods relevant to economic evaluation and illustrate a sample application of mixed methods from a recent economic evaluation that the authors completed. A strength of this illustration is the application of the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) as a checklist.

Additional comments:

Page 8, Lines 21-26: For the referenced study, it would be useful to elaborate on the mixed methods used for economic evaluation.

Page 12, Line 22: The authors mention that many challenges and unanswered questions remain in this area of research. Are there universal challenges that could be made explicit in this paragraph outside of the case study presented by the authors?

Table 1: For the 4 categories under Structure, it may be helpful to the reader to see examples for each category, consistent with the other sections in the table where examples are provided.
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