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Reviewer's report:

This study uses a scoping review methodology to identify actions and contexts that foment the development and functioning of partnerships between researchers and government public policy stakeholders to improve the use of research in policy-making.

I think the article is of interest to HRPS audience and, as authors point out, can foment further research on this topic.

The background and justification for this review are well-presented. The methodology section contains elements required in a scoping review and the results section describes the articles included and the reasons for exclusion for some of the articles. I have some comments on these sections:

-There is no information on the "Study type" in the inclusion criteria.
-There is no mention on the type of analysis carried out to extract the information from the articles, did you use content analysis, thematic analysis or any other type of qualitative analysis?
-If you could provide a clear example of the evolution of inclusion and exclusion criteria according to findings (as mentioned in page 5, lines 43-45, it is an iterative process), I think this could be of interest to other researchers applying a similar review methodology.
-If I think if you could add the actions and contexts identified in each article, as well as the articles outcomes, to the descriptive table (Table 3), it would provide a more complete picture of the results of this review.

The discussion and conclusions are based on the results presented and point out plans for further research as well as limitations to analyse ES partnerships due to gaps in the literature encountered; however, I think you did not include limitations derived from the review methodology followed.
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