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Summary: The authors report on the advantages of Participatory Dynamic Simulation (PDS) for mobilizing multiple sources of knowledge to address health policy development. The authors should make more clear what is novel focus is of this report in the background/set-up. 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.

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?

Abstract:

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

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

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 Make clear two published case studies and one unpublished is the basis for the discussion.

PDS overview section

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

1. Box 2 should be Box 1?

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

Conclusions

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