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Reviewer's report:

The authors did a great job acting on the feedback provided in the last round, and the paper's methods, results, discussion and overall analytic strength has improved significantly.

I realize in reviewing the paper, however, that an issue raised by both myself and other reviewers that has yet to be adequately addressed in the methods section is the rational for selecting each case at the outset of the study (i.e. the sampling logic). While the authors have provided some additional detail, it isn't clear, from an analytical standpoint, why comparing these two cases in particular is ideal in this case. Are there variables that are 'constant' across both that can be seen as contextual controls, and variation among other variables that can help understand how these factors may or may not have lead to different policy processes and use of evidence? This still isn't clear (note: I have noticed that in the discussion on page 30 the authors mention variation in cases, so they've obviously considered this, but haven't written it as an element of their methods).

Discretionary revisions

It may be helpful if the authors could provide, in a clearer and explicit way, some of the key findings from Table 1 in the text. These results are clearly important, but are currently lost in the narrative (so readers are forced to go to the table to get the whole story--whereas this table should serve as a complement).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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