Reviewer’s report

Title: Stakeholders’ experiences with the Evidence Aid website to support ‘real-time’ use of research evidence to inform decision-making in crisis zones: A user testing study

Version: 0 Date: 04 Aug 2019

Reviewer: Yen-Yuan Chen

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this opportunity allowing me to review this manuscript. This manuscript reported a study conducted to evaluate users' and non-users' opinions about an Evidence Aid website. I provided some suggestions, which I believe, to further polish this manuscript:

Although the title of this manuscript seemed to inform the future readers that this study was focused on decision-makers' experiences with the Evidence Aid website, actually in the manuscript, the authors sampled non-users, healthcare providers, field managers, advisors, analysts and researchers. I would suggest the authors to have a term to replace "decision-maker" in the title, and to comprehensively cover all the different roles included in this study.

At the end of Background, the last two sentences are exactly the same as the first two sentences at the beginning of Methods—aims. It is either redundant, or a careless copy-paste, both of which are not good in academic writings. I would suggest the authors make some changes.

The main target in this study is the Evidence Aid website. Although the authors gave a detail portrayal in Methods about what the website looks like, I would suggest the authors give the link of the website. By doing so, the reviewers, as well as the future readers of the study may have an even better portrayal about the Evidence Aid website.

Collecting data from users and non-users actually makes senses. However, the authors did not provide a rationale for why feedback and opinions must be collected from the five roles: senior decision-makers, healthcare providers, field managers, advisors, analysts and researchers. I would suggest to provide a rationale in Background, or a sampling method from a qualitative methodological perspective.

Following the previous point, the authors are highly suggested to let the readers and reviewers know the results in this manuscript were sufficiently saturated. Given the tables provided in this manuscript, only 1-3 interviewees were interviewed in each category of the participants. It is not easy to say that 1-3 interviewees from a single category provided sufficiently saturated feedback and opinions to the topic of research interests.

This is a qualitative study. On page 11, the authors mentioned "Global guidelines were mostly used by advisors." Do the authors mention this point in Results based on numbers, feelings, ……or other things else? Please provide information to support this.
I would suggest the authors to further strengthen the academic merits of this study in Strengths and Limitations. I read through the entire manuscript for several times. I know the authors established a pretty good Evidence Aid website, and tried very hard to evaluate whether the website is good using a qualitative way. I, as a reader, would like to know the strengths of this study as my take-home messages, how would the results influence/change my practice in critical zones.
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