Reviewer’s report

Title: The research-policy-deliberation nexus: a case study approach

Version: 0 Date: 24 Mar 2017

Reviewer: Arja R. Aro

Reviewer's report:

1. The used qualitative approach is welcome as such. The manuscript is also well written in general.

2. However, when introducing the state of the art and importance of the study, the literature used is rather selective. E.g. previous papers and their relevant findings and frameworks on the research-policy nexus have not been cited. Examples include de Leeuw et al production but also recent papers of others about research-policy collaboration and knowledge co-creation. This is somewhat surprising.

3. Further, there is no theoretical or conceptual logic presented why certain programs were selected to test the Murray framework and models, except that the programs fit the levels of the framework. The program to test the first model started 10 years ago and represents thus historical approach which might be less prevalent nowadays.

4. The Murray model was complemented by concept/framework of governance; however, this concept/framework is defined very shortly and does not give full picture why and how it is used. Since governance it very central to the discussion and conclusion, it would be important to elaborate the concept/framework more.

5. The abstract starts with a quote from literature but in the abstract it gives rather naïve impression of casuistic thinking. The sentence is OK later when a reference can be given.

6. The manuscript (including abstract) mentions how research is taken on board often late in the process; however, on lines 275-277 it is stated that technocrats were used early in the process; it is the latter which we often see in policy practice- this issue is not dealt with later in the manuscript.
7. The statement of Model 1, lines 304-305 says that 'inclusivity of researchers in proceedings potentially have mitigated' the issues described; however, the text this sentence refers to, does not write anything specific about researcher involvement.

8. The discussion is informative but partly it repeats results and also brings up results not reported in the results section. Further, the discussion does not explicitly show how the present findings relate to those published earlier and elsewhere on the same/similar topic. So the manuscript fails to show if and how it adds to the knowledge base. This is also a lack when the concept of participation is dealt with; the tens of years old Ottawa Charter is not necessarily the best reference there.

9. The conclusion section is partly more like a discussion with its use of references etc. The conclusion is also long and repeats results and discussion texts.
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