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Reviewer's report:

This was an excellent, well thought out research study exploring an important issue- the use of scientific evidence by decision makers.

The background clearly laid the foundation for the research. The clear definitions were helpful in clarifying the focus of the article.

The methods were carefully outlined and appropriate for the methodology chosen. Provision of the interview guide would have been helpful.

Results were described clearly and supported by Table 1.

I did not find that Figure 1 resonated with the discussion. I think it was probably the qualifiers between the categories under key concepts.

The description of the decision maker, in particular, did not seem to fit. I wonder if this table could be reconsidered to make the connections between and within the data more explicit.

Although not in the scope of this study, it would have been interesting to hear the researchers thoughts on how knowledge of these factors should inform implementation efforts.

Overall, an excellent paper, well written, adding an important evidence to the implementation cascade.
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