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Reviewer's report:

Major comments:

1. This systematic literature review assessed the quality of methodologies used in health economic evaluation in implementation and quality improvement research from 2004 to 2015. The paper provides an overall assessment of the quality of the literature by presenting the overall scores of the Quality of Health Economic Studies (QHES) framework. However, the paper doesn't assess specific areas for improvement. The contribution of the paper will increase significantly if it can identify specific areas for future improvement.

   1) It will be much more helpful to examine the individual components of the QHES to identify the areas that need to be improved for future studies.

   2) Assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the cost measures and effectiveness outcome measures of the literature will be important to inform future research.

2. An important aspect of economic evaluation is to assess the cost of implementation strategies, which is critical for organizations when considering their options of implementing evidence-based care. I would suggest that the authors consider including this type of cost studies. Below are a few publications in this area.
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