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Reviewers report:

Target population

Two-stage sampling approach is used to identify and recruit key informant: The use of KII approach is good and participant identification is appropriate.

Page 2, Line 26: The author mentioned that data were collected from decision makers.

Page 2, Line 41: The interviewees included senior decision-makers, advisors, field managers, analysts/researchers, etc.

Questions: Are all the interviewees decision makers?

Evidence Aid

The author does not explain about the Evidence Aid website clearly. In page 4 line 24, the authors mentioned the Evidence Aid website, but did not indicate clearly of the aforementioned website.

Tables

Table 2 Page 26

Using both bolded checkmark and bolded bullet point make harder for reader to interpret the important data from the table. It loses the message that the author wanted to give to the audience.

Table 3 Page 29

Table legend, such as italicized and bolded point, make the reader confused.

Under minor issues column, one bold and italicized bullet point and 4 bolded bullet point were described. The reader may lose their interest as they have to read the legend and interpret again, especially for 4 pages table.

Every table page should have the table heading.
Question

Page 3, line 46 mentioned about the gap in the literature.
How does the results of the article address the gap in the literature?
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