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Reviewer's report:

I thought this review was conducted in a straightforward and sensible manner. I have some only some minor comments:

83-85 "many third sector organisations (TSOs) fail to evaluate their activities following the principles of evidence-based practice (EBP, which are broadly defined as "

the integration of clinical expertise, patient values, and the best evidence into the decision making process for patient care." - these principles seem to relate to knowledge translation rather than to be principles for evaluation as such. The same tensions is present in the following lines (84-86): adherence to best practice in delivery of services vs being able to evidence impact. I can see that evaluation would be considered part of this approach (you have to know whether something is working as intended in order to learn from it and to improve things) but you might want to spell this out more explicitly.

118 "why TSOs struggle to demonstrate their impact" - though could also be that they (or some of them) choose not to do this or do not see the value of it; as it is your wording is slightly normative.

157-8 I thought the wording of the objective was unclear and could be improved. "What barriers and facilitators do third sector organisations experience when evaluating their services as identified by third sector practitioners?" seems to imply that the services are identified by practitioners. I think a better wording would be:

"What barriers and facilitators do third sector practitioners identify in relation to evaluating the services their organisations provide?"
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