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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This is an article of importance in a complex field, which is the decision-making. Using evidence-based information support and guide decision-makers to take rational societal decisions. Overall, the paper the way written is a bit confusing. Thus, my review will concentrate on minor and major suggestions that could help authors to improve the clarity of their manuscript.

Minor revisions

Abstract

The abstract is a bit confusing. It's hard to understand the methods conducted and the results obtained from the review. Also the main purpose of the study is missing. I would like authors to review it.

The authors, in the methods, highlighted that they "give an overview of and describe practical experiences from the open policy practice method…". However, the methods the way presented is a bit confusing. The reader is not able to understand if authors are talking about their method conducted to realize the overview or they are describing the open online policy practice methods usually used for decision-making by the NIHW.

I do believe they mentioned an overview, but an overview is an extensive review of the general evidence including internal documents and publications, based on a search strategy for internal and external evidence. So the process conducted is missing. How did you access the evidence? What kind of documents did you consult? Internal documents, reports, letters, publications? Any electronic documents consulted? Databases? What were the main concepts searched and extracted from each document? Any grid used for information selection?
Background

"In this article, decision support means knowledge work that is performed during the whole decision process (assessing, deciding, implementing, and evaluating) and that aims to produce better decisions and outcomes", please consider adding a reference.

Authors stated "open policy practice, a set of methods and tools for improving science-based policy making". Those methods and tools are platforms? Checklists?

p. 4, Authors stated, "In this article, we will give…"; "We will also take a step…", please consider changing the future tense "will give" ; "we will discuss…", to present or past tense, the work is already done.

Also, in the last 2 paragraphs, from "In this article, we will give the first comprehensive, peer-reviewed description…" to "…of scientific information in societal decision making", we can understand indirectly the main aim and the underlying specific objectives of your study, however this wasn't clearly stated. Please consider revising and reformulating them in purpose and objective format in order to help readers to better understand and follow you.

Major revision

Methods

In the methods section, the reader isn't able to understand how the authors proceeded in their peer-review study to describe the methodology and tools of open policy practice, and how they evaluated the methods.

It would be more helpful if authors differentiate between the review methods conducted and the methods of open policy practice elaborated. I would like authors to provide more information about the search strategy used including databases searched, documents consulted (type of document), keywords used to search all the evidence and how the extraction of evidence have been conducted.
Also, the methods, the way presented, is a bit confusing. Are authors presenting here the different open practice policy methods? So the section 'methods' is a part of the background? If so, I would like authors to change the title of this section to for ex. Methods of the open practice policy and then to link this section with the background by adding few sentences introducing the different methods of the open practice policy used by the NIHW prior to detailing them.

Also it would be more helpful for readers if authors start by presenting the open practice policy and then the underlying methods.

Authors stated "We will also take a step back and critically evaluate the methods used during the last 17 years…", How did authors evaluate the methods? Any checklist used? This should be well explained in the methods section to help readers better understand.

P.5, line 50, change "If they are not able make such…” to "If they are not able to make such…”


How drew chain such figure 1 can help decision-makers to decide clearly on specific idea / subject?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of each method/tool? What are the criteria that define the choice of each method to use? All the methods are still active and used? Can we combine between all these methods? In other terms can we use more than one method at the same time to be more informed on decisions?

Why different methods were developed? Who decides on the choice of the appropriate method?

Can anyone access this platform and use the methods?
There is a need to evaluate the assessment work before, during, and after it is done. The criteria mentioned in the table are applied to assess the decision process? Which assessment work has to be evaluated as pointed by the authors?

Also, authors are talking about assessment/evaluation (open assessment). How each criteria will be measured? Is there any score to calculate for each criteria and based on what a final decision will be taken? Or it's a yes/no checklist?

Results
The results the way presented is a bit confusing. I would like authors to clarify better what are the results about presented in this section. Authors stated "Experiences from these assessments were used to evaluate the methods", are the results about the assessment of each method of the open policy practice or assessment of the results obtained from each project in which one method was used. Please consider adding more information in this regard.

Also, we don't clearly understand the impact of each support method on decisions. In the results section, we like to see how each method has contributed to the improvement of decision-making processes and how actions will be taken by decision-makers based on assessments.

Authors stated Experiences from these assessments were used to evaluate the methods. See Table 8. However, Table 8 shows some criteria to evaluate projects/articles/courses/?? Please explain.

Discussion
It would be helpful for readers in general and decision makers in particular if authors consider discussing the different open policy practice tools and methods in terms of advantages and disadvantages.
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