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Use of health economic evaluation in implementation and quality improvement research - a systematic literature review

This review is an update from a similar review conducted in 2003.

The manuscript could be strengthened with attention to the following points:

1) From my viewpoint this review misses an opportunity to present new information on economic evaluation of implementation / improvement science. It adds little to the literature. The aim was to examine advances, however the manuscript focuses on a count of the number of new evaluations in this field and a quality assessment of the economic evaluations of implementation/improvement studies.

2) The systematic review inclusion criteria have limited included studies to English language. This may produce a publication bias and non-English language studies, for example, French, Spanish would have been addition to the prior review.

3) Minor: some grammatical issues should be rectified to improve readability.

4) Some explanation of how the databases were chosen and the benefit of using Rayyan for screening and data extraction would be informative.

5) Detail about the methodological advances with respect to the economic evaluation of implementation / improvements studies would be interesting.

6) Further detail about the nature of the implementation / improvements studies included in the review would also be interesting. i.e. expand Table 2

7) A stronger rationale for a cut-off of 75/100 for good quality in QHES instrument is needed.
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