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The authors did a very good job. But the article needs editorial revision as there are some unnecessary repetitions of words. Some comments are also as follows.

Methods

- The authors mentioned there were three phases in the prioritization exercise. However, there is no specific date when these phases of activities were carried out. I recommend the authors to specify when these activities were carried out. No time was mentioned to explain when the study was started and end.

- Line 32 - 34, the authors mentioned that there were 'do not know' and 'not applicable' options when scoring. It is good if they mentioned how these options were finally scored, that is how they were analyzed. What value was given to these scores? was it 0, 1, or 5?

Results

- The authors listed the top 50 research problems. The reason why 50 was not justified either in the methods or result section.

Discussion

- Line 206 -2020 - the author emphasized on the selection of participants and the whole process of prioritization exercise. This better taken to the method section. The authors compared their exercise process (response rate) with other studies. This is not important. Still it can be taken to the methods section. Generally, most ideas in this section better included in the methods section.
- The discussion is shallow. The results are not interpreted and discussed well. For example, service providers and the academia identified different questions. The reason for this should be explained.
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