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Reviewer's report:

This is a qualitative study using an in-depth interviews and document review to investigate the obstacles in applying results from the National Health Examination Survey (NHES) into policies at country level. The manuscript is well written with important messages, the findings would benefit other low- and middle-income countries in designing population health surveys. I would like to accept this paper with minor revisions. Please see the list of points that needed to be clarified or fixed below.

1. P1, L16: Please be more specific about the method used in this study. In the abstract, the authors mention in-depth interviews and document review in the method section, however the majority of the results are from the interview.

2. P4, L55: missing reference in the NHANES application in raising awareness of public health institutes and concerned parties on the rising trends of NCDs.

3. P8, L9: The authors use an establishment of a countrywide diabetes screening program as the successful example for the use of NHES data in policy making. The authors should discuss this success later in the Discussion.

4. In the conclusion, the authors seem to put more weight of evidence on the data governance issues in the shortcoming of NHES study. I would suggest that the nature of NHES survey itself is equally important because it prohibits the usage of this evidence in a policy cycle. The amount of time required to complete the survey does not allow the deliver of study results in the timely policy relevance. (see P9, L29: the section investigated why NHES data is rarely used in policy monitoring and evaluation). The manuscript convinced me that this is one of the major drivers for the development of alternative risk factor surveys. Similarly, another example is that the NHES appears to be incapable of adapting its content to address the funding agencies' need (both MOPH and Thai Health). As a result, the use of NHES data in policy process is limited.

5. P14, L38: The conclusion in the final paragraph is vague. Please explain why you think the conceptual framework are not suitable for capturing the survey data in policy shift in this study.
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