Review comment-1

This manuscript may offer valuable insights for early-career researchers who have limited experience engaging with policymakers or advocating for policy change. In contrast, more experienced researchers and scholars are likely familiar with the dynamics of policy engagement and may find the study's findings less novel or impactful.

Among the seven case studies analyzed, six are situated within the U.S. policy context and one within the U.K. Given the differences in policy-making procedures across countries, it is unclear whether the findings can be generalized globally. To enhance clarity and relevance, the author may consider focusing exclusively on the U.S.-based studies and framing the analysis within a more specific national context. Based on the manuscript, the primary focus appears to be on homelessness-related policies. Therefore, I suggest the revised title: "Filtering Evidence: Politics, Communication, and Resource Pressures in the U.S. Homelessness Policy Context."

I consider this an engaging and thought-provoking article. The author effectively highlights the challenges surrounding how policymakers utilize research in the policy-making process. The manuscript provides a well-articulated background on the methodology employed, and the research process is clearly explained It is unsurprising that the author identifies three overarching themes, as they reflect the complexities of real-world policy environments. The discussion section presents several insightful arguments, particularly regarding the multiple considerations involved in decision-making, the role of trusted brokers, and the impact of financial constraints.

From my own experience, policymakers often prioritize research findings from well-known scholars, suggesting that the identity of the researcher can be more influential than the evidence itself. Additionally, the allocation of research funding frequently mirrors policy priorities. Scholars who secure substantial government-related grants often do so in areas that align with current policy concerns. The author may consider expanding the discussion to include these dynamics, as they further illustrate the interplay between research, reputation, and policy influence.