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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made notable strides to improve on the previously submitted manuscript based on reviewers' comments. This paper has a lot of potential and is an important contribution as it documents an evidence to policy case study. However, I am sorry to note that a significant component of reporting that was highlighted is missing:

Comment 1: There are established research methods in the area of observational documentation and evaluation of the policy development process.....Some background on this would be useful.

Whilst there is an improvement in having a methods section, the authors have still not made any attempts to link their work to an established model or framework in the introductory and methods section, or to reported case studies in this area in the discussion section.

I have noted that my co-reviewer also highlighted this in her comment #2. "The retelling of the story of evidence use would be greatly enhanced by the use an existing policy process model or conceptual framework. As a starting point the authors may wish to consult Buse K, Mays N, Walt G: Making Health Policy. New York: Open University Press; 2007, in which such models are summarised."

I think that going this extra mile would make a very strong case for the contribution of this work to the research utilization field.

Some examples that immediately come to mind to illustrate this which may be of help to the authors include Crewe & Young 2002 – RAPID framework; Walt and Gilson's policy triangle; The Kingdon framework.

Also see Daniels et al 2008 – case study in South Africa; Hutchinson et al 2011 – case study in Zambia, Malawi & Uganda; Cliff et all 2011 - Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

Again, these may assist the authors on how to frame their useful contributions.

I hope you will make the suggested essential revision to make for a stronger scientific publication.
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