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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: HRPS-D-17-00059-Knowledge Mobilization for policy development: Implementing systems approaches through participatory dynamic simulation modeling

Summary: The authors report on the advantages of Participatory Dynamic Simulation (PDS) for mobilizing multiple sources of knowledge to address health policy development.

Reviewer comment

The authors should make more clear what is novel focus is of this report in the background/setup. The paper nicely reviews the need but could benefit with improved organization. In particular, a Box with bullet points of the PSD knowledge elements would be helpful, i.e., moving from evidence to timely/dynamic decision support, deliberative methods, and co-production of knowledge.

Response
A text box has been included at the start of the manuscript with bullet points highlighting key elements of participatory dynamic simulation modelling (PDSM) as a knowledge mobilization tool and key insights for operationalizing (PDSM) projects.

Reviewer comment

It is unclear from the paper how computer modeling output was visualized by the participants, i.e., did they visualize dynamic graphic displays? If so, can a depiction of the output be included?

Response

Images of user interfaces and example output visualizations and brief descriptions have been included in the manuscript (see Box 3).

Reviewer comment

Abstract:

1. Last sentence of the background (line 36-38) should be moved to the conclusion. Background should just state the problem.

Response

This sentence has been removed and incorporated in the conclusion.

Reviewer comment

2. Objective should state that 3 case studies are reviewed.

Response

This is now included

Reviewer comment

Background.

Nice review of problems of putting evidence-based knowledge into decision making and the importance of collective-decision making. Make clear two published case studies and one unpublished is the basis for the discussion.

Response
This is now included.

Reviewer comment

PDS overview section

1. Appears Box 1 is entered in error? Appears to be the 2nd paragraph of this section.

Response

Box 1 has been removed and text appears as 2nd paragraph in the section.

Reviewer comment

Case Study Overviews

1. Box 2 should be Box 1?

Response

Box 2 remains as Box 2 due to new text box at the beginning of the paper.

Reviewer comment

2. Section beginning at line 424 should be set off with a section heading, e.g., "Key aspects of PSD".

Response

Heading included: Key aspects of operationalising participatory dynamic simulation modelling

Reviewer comment

Conclusions

Could be reduced in length. Some of the material is a restatement of earlier discussion.

Response

Conclusion has been reduced in length. Sentences repeating earlier discussion have been removed.