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Reviewer’s report:

In many ways this is a good paper. I basically agree with the author and I think that her points are well argued. However, the paper is too long. By page 12 I started to lose my concentration and from there I had a difficult time following the author. There was too much description of what this author or that author says in her or his paper, often not that related to the main points made in the current paper. Examples are Chenitz and Carter 9-11 and then again Spiers, Nordvet and Sellman. The author needs to simplify the text and focus on just the main ideas. Use the literature to make her own point, rather than telling us what different people have said in detail. The author makes the difference between vulnerability as an individualistic experience vs. a contextual thing structured by class, gender, ethnicity etc. I think that a clearer presentation of the analysis along those lines would be very helpful. As an example - the text on page 16-18 could be shortened considerably and somehow I would not bring in the idea of a subjective stance of vulnerability. These are all examples of authors who talk about vulnerability as an individual experience and therefore they are part of the individualistic tradition. The same problem emerges in the section on the 21 century. There are too detailed quotes from different papers and sometimes the text goes on for two pages without a paragraph.

The author needs to look more carefully at the reference list.