

Review comment-2

The article has strong potential for publication due to its methodological rigor, practical implications, and timely focus on evidence-informed policy. However, significant revisions are needed to strengthen theoretical framing, streamline presentation, and clarify the study's scope and transferability.

The use of Qualitative Interpretive Meta-Synthesis (QIMS) is a strength, as it adapts a rigorous methodological framework to consolidate findings across multiple qualitative studies. The paper contributes valuable insights into the political, relational, and financial dynamics shaping evidence use, which are directly relevant to social work scholars and practitioners engaged in advocacy and policy development.

The authors acknowledge their dual role as students and researchers, which is ethically transparent. However, ethical review procedures (IRB approval, use of secondary data, and student involvement in real-world publication) are not explicitly mentioned. Since only secondary qualitative studies were analyzed, human subjects risk is low, but clarification would strengthen ethical validity.

The team's reflexivity and interdisciplinary perspectives are noted. Still, given the pedagogical context, potential bias from instructor oversight (grading and authorship roles) should be addressed more explicitly about your positionality bias.

Since the analysis depends entirely on published studies, the richness of interpretation is limited by the original authors' reporting. There is little engagement with grey literature, practitioner reports, or community-based perspectives.

Specific Comments:

1.Limitations and Weaknesses

- The synthesis is based on only seven qualitative studies, none of which directly focused on municipal homelessness coordination (the initial sampling goal). This raises questions about how far findings can be extended to municipal-level social welfare policy in scope of data.
- Over-Reliance on Secondary Sources: Since the analysis depends entirely on published studies, the richness of interpretation is limited by the original authors' reporting. There is little engagement with grey literature, practitioner reports, or community-based perspectives.

- **Writing and Redundancy:** The manuscript is overly long and occasionally repetitive, especially in presenting the three themes. Quotes are extensive and sometimes overshadow the authors' analytic voice. Streamlining could improve readability.

2. Areas for Improvement

- **Sharpen the Focus of the narrative to reduce redundancy.** The three themes could be presented more succinctly, with fewer block quotes and more comparative synthesis.
- **Strengthen Theoretical Links:** Situate findings more clearly within established frameworks on evidence use in policymaking (e.g., symbolic vs. instrumental use, research utilization models).
- **Address Transferability:** Be more explicit about the contextual limits of the synthesis and the degree to which findings apply to municipal social welfare policy broadly.
- **Balance Pedagogical and Research Goals:** The manuscript is sometimes read like a course project report rather than a polished research article. Future versions should emphasize scholarly contributions over classroom logistics.
- **Engage Missing Voices:** Include more attention to community, practitioner, or client perspectives (either from supplementary literature or as a limitation).

Recommendation

Revise and Resubmit (minor Revisions).

The article has strong potential for publication due to its methodological rigor, practical implications, and timely focus on evidence-informed policy.