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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

It was a great pleasure reviewing your manuscript. I found it to be very relevant in the promotion of evidence to policy link. However, the manuscript contains too many errors both grammatical and typographical, which makes it difficult to read without stress. It is important that you carefully go through and effect the following corrections and recommendations I made following this review.

Line 56 pg 2: ….Department of Planning, Research and Statistics
Line 9 pg 4:……losses
Line 41 pg 4:…..infested
Line 19 pg 6:…..evidence from research
Line 29 pg 6:……addressed, strategies to boost
Line 41-46 pg 6, should rephrased with proper punctions.
Line 10-17 pg 7:…..The study explored the barriers to users' of evidence in decision making as regards to the control of ETDs in the State by the producers and users of evidence drawn from tertiary institutions and health organization in the study State.
Line 30 pg 7:…..Remove the study population were producers and users of evidence
Line 34 pg 7:…..are involved in HPSR and other research evidence generation.
Line 44 pg 7:……Remove one state. Continue as …..COOU, also with 3 campuses located at…..
Line 49 pg 7:…..Redefine the users of evidence thus…These are policy makers, SHM and PO, who make use of or should make use of evidence in decision making and health programming. They were selected from various departments/ units in the SMoH and health agencies, including public health/disease control; Planning, Research and Statistics;…..
Lines 14-32 pg 8:…..use semi-colons rather than comas eg Pharmacy; Planning, Research and Statistics;…..
Lines 26-27 pg 8:…..State Ministry of Economic Planning and Budgeting. This should apply to others including the name of the state and wherever State is used as a place.
Line 4 pg 9:…..Table title should be independently descriptive. Eg Background characteristics of POE and UOE in Anambra State, Nigeria.
Line 12 pg 11:…..political interferences
Line 29 pg 11:…..producers of evidence
Synchronize table 2 properly regarding Poor demand and support for research evidence

Line 19 pg 15:……and release of fund

Line 26 pg 15:…..data records are incomplete
Lines 46-53 pg 15:….for implementing the preferred program. ….implementation of EDCP, to a large extent, politicians…..to take up.

Line 60 pg 15:…..or used as political settlement.

Line 26 pg 16:…..remove include

Line 31 pg 16:…..integrating use of research evidence

Line 36 pg 16:…..remove that and which. … The existing "top-bottom" decision-making approach, excludes relevant actors at all levels of care and consequently, lead to poor implementation outcomes.

Line 51 pg 16:…..remove and & to. … "Policymakers (users of evidence) do not appreciate the importance of research evidence, that is why there is poor demand".

Line 58 pg 16:…..in terms

Line 12 pg 17:….. remove following & to

Line 17 pg 18:…..State Health Research and Ethics Committee

Line 26 pg 18:…..both State and Federal University in the State

Line 34 pg 18:…..remove at…..fund for research

Line 43 pg 18:…..Among other recommended solutions,

Line 48 pg 18:…..ETDs. Remove is

Line 49 pg 18:…..to be created in order to

Line 4 pg 19:….. and a State website for research evidence generated in the state"

Line 4 pg 26:…..Participants'

Line 41 pg 19:…..Research Triangle Institute

Line 4 pg 20:…..the identified barriers

Line 14-19 pg 20:…..The statement is ambiguous and confusing, rephrase it for clarity. Suggestion: …which underscores the …. as found in the study …

Line 31 pg 20:….. This emphasizes the power of stakeholders' inclusiveness in health sector particularly in disease control. HOW? The statement is out of context.

Line 38 pg 20:….. relevant users of evidence in research priority

Line 38 pg 20:…..remove the findings. The poor demand for research evidence reflects poor value and low priority attached on research evidence by users of evidence probably because of poor level of
producers-users of evidence collaboration, poor understanding of research evidence and its application, as well as policy makers' lack of technical capacity for integrating research evidence into policy and practice have been reported in some countries in LMICs.

Lines 28-33 pg 21: Very ambiguous and confusing, kindly rephrase.

Lines 22-24 pg 22: State-funded or State-supported research studies will translate to increase research evidence use and increase demand for research evidence.

Lines 38-46 pg 22: NOT CLEAR

Line 56 pg 22: Remove utilization.

Line 34 pg 23: Remove is appropriate interaction between researchers and policymakers

Line 9 pg 24: Remove of the. …and enables collective accountability in implementing research objectives [42].

Lines 29-34 pg 24: remove the. …It has been recognized that the importance of developing and investing on national health research capacity for local research institutes in low-and middle income countries as a key element in strengthening countries' health systems has been stressed globally [16].

Line 40 pg 24: for control of ETDs is

Line 58 pg 24: Odumegwu

Line 9 PG 26: The references are haphazardly compiled. Refer and adhere to the specifications of HRPS.

Thanks
Dr Chukwu Onyedikachi E
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