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Dear Ms Reyes,

Many thanks for the response and helpful comments to our article: ‘Social Action or Critical Analysis? A concept analysis of critical health literacy’ MS: 1578704964760873. We were pleased that overall both reviewers believe that the aim of the paper to add clarity to the concept of Critical Health Literacy is worthwhile and that the methods of the concept analysis are suitably rigorous. We have reviewed the article in the light of the comments made by the referees and offer the following amendments.

Referee 1.
1. Calls for a link to be made with other literacies. This has been made and added on page 21 paragraph 1
2. Questions the title. This has been amended to Understanding Critical Health literacy: a concept analysis.

Referee 2.
3. States that there are some errors with the numbered referencing particularly on page 14. All references have been double checked and no errors found on page 14. One reference [54] was found to be a duplicate of reference [9] and has been amended.
4. States that many papers quoted are not accessible. All papers have been checked and have been found to be accessible. All papers are books still in print, are from published journals or are reports which are currently available online. One source is an unpublished PhD thesis but this is available via the Index to Theses.
5. Questions the choice of some quotes. The use of quotes has been reviewed and on order to provide clarity as to the relevance of quotes the introductory narrative has been amended where it was thought confusion might lie (page 14 and 15).
6. Questions how readable the paper is. The paper has now been reviewed internally by an academic not associated with the study. She found the paper to be easy to read and the line of argument easy to follow and digest. It is noted that referee one found the standard of English to be excellent.
7. Questions how the paper advances the field. Some additions to page 6 hopefully provide further clarity on this. While there have been attempts to define critical health literacy before, there are no papers published which do so using such a systematic process and which go beyond theoretical definitions and incorporate the understandings of practitioners and policy makers. It is noted that referee one felt that the relation to existing work and contribution to the field were clearly framed and that new insights into the concept of health literacy are provided.
8. The paper has been reviewed with reference to the purported gap between results and conclusions and the link is shown as follows:
a. Conclusion that the term is unique – shown through unique list of attributes, antecedents and consequences and in particular through the lack of surrogate terms identified. The difference between CHL and the closest resemblant term, empowerment, has
also been supported in the findings through the inclusion of information skills.

b. The term is useful – shown through the list of potential consequences in the findings (page 17)

c. That there is not consistency in how the term is understood – shown through the contextual analysis and in particular the comparison between theoretical and colloquial data within the findings (page 12-15)

d. That the definition is changing with time with a decrease in emphasis on the political action elements – again shown through the contextual analysis within the findings section –page 14

e. There needs to be a closer engagement with the field of community development – this conclusion does not fall as directly from the findings as the previous conclusions. It has emerged from the discussion section and is intended as a suggested way forward. It has been reframed as such within the text (page 24)

It is again noted that referee one stated that the data provides significant grounds for the conclusions.

Editor’s comments:
Addressed in points 7 and 8 above.

Formatting amendments:

1. Acknowledgements and funding information added before references.
2. Figure title listed after references and removed from figure file.
3. Figure 1 cropped.
4. Title page amended.