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Major revision

Introduction

1- the objective of study is not clear, both in abstract and introduction.

2- the meaning of paragraph 2 is not clear.

3- in some places the authors have claimed that the exits tools are not suitable for LMICs but it is not clear why?

4- the definition and distinguish of "organization" and "system" needs to be more clear.

5- the part "conceptual framework" mush move to the method part.

6- in the section of "conceptual framework", why peer review journals have searched separately? all of them are indexed in PubMed and Scopus.

7- there is 2 question about ranking the articles, why the authors have done ranking instead of screening(if the articles objective is similar of the project, it must be included , why usefulness and applicability have used for ranking). another point is that using one abstractor for judgment about usefulness and applicability confound the validity of this judgment.

8- it's not clear which papers and by which method have used for extracting data from papers in order to developing the instrument.
9- there is not very strong interpretation about the weakness of another instruments in this field and why they are not appropriate for LMICs.

Methods

the steps of instrument standardization mush be explained in the first part of method.

10- the structure of method is not consistent, e.g paragraph 2 of methods (line 29-37) is about validity but in the end of methods there is separate part for validity.

11- in the paragraph 2 of methods (line 29-37):

what's the meaning of this sentences" the extent to which the items could be generalized ... of that domain", the authors gave asked respondent to rate the questionnaire items whether they believed the items was a valid measure of capacity to demand and use research, what decision have been made according to the response?

12- in the part of instrument components, there is only description about questions related to the individual and organization level. What about system level? In the supplementary file of instrument, we cannot distinguish the questions related to the individual, organizational and system. Also the title of sections in instrument is not similar to the text.

13- the pilot study is not suitable for data collection section which has done for standardize the instrument.

14- in table 3 it is necessary to explain the position of respondent more clear, are they decision makers or persons who support decision makers? It is very important.

15- in the data collection part:

it's necessary to describe more about training cycle, the objective, the detail of training and the characteristics of research team in each country.

the objective of reflection and exit interview( discussion questions in instrument, why the name is not same?), the method of analysis them is not clear.
16- in the data analysis part:

paragraph 2 is not clear. I cannot see the Varity type of response in the instrument.

17- in the reliability part:

it's necessary to introduce references for interpretation verification method. Also it's necessary to clear the analysis of open ended questions in this part.

18- in test retest part: the distance between 1 day and 6 months is so long. why is this happen? What will be the effect of this variety in the interpretation of test retest result?

Result

19- In the EFA part: the authors must explain the theoretical nature of 2 factors here.

20- why the authors have used EFA instead of CFA?

21- it's necessary to picture the relationship between 3 levels by domains and by items(each question) before and after deletion in one table that readers can judge about the deleted item and it's effect on the validity of instrument (similar to the table 6).

22- in page 7 the seven domains(recognition ... influence) had been attributed to the individual capacity but in the table 6 we see them for both individual and organizational capacity. This is very confusing.

Discussion

23- discussion is weak. Discussion must emphasis on the standardization of instrument , it's objective and application, it's competency in this field and in compare with another’s. Also the future research for improving the instrument should be describe.

Limitation

24- the meaning of "time frame" is not clear.
25- why the using of this instrument is challenging in LMICs but not in HICs? Which part and aspect of this instrument is specific to the LMICs?

Minor revision:

26- it will be so better if authors prepare supplementary about the structure of MoH in each country.

27- the pilot study is nor suitable word for data collection process as one step in standardization of instruments.
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