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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written and crafted paper and it is thoughtful and thought provoking. Its intent is to question age-related, and categorised, practices relating to where people are located within care settings and places, with a focus on children with profound impairments being moved on to adult institutions as they reach 'adulthood'. The paper has good flow and it is fluent and well structured. I feel it would benefit by making a few qualifications to some arguments and a clearer contextualisation of the subject matter.

1. The main issue for me is to ensure that the reader will be conversant with the broader issues/debates about the shift of people from one care context to another. The paper does not say much about how and why such 'age regimes' exist, and how one might begin to explain them. As a reader I need to know a bit more about how and why the institutionalisation of movement, by age category, has taken hold, and a bit more about how far it is specific to Canada or a more general part of 'western care systems'. So, think about a more careful contextualisation - it will help the reader.

2. I think the paper could usefully draw attention to more evidence to back up the claims being made - so, on page 7 of the manuscript, first paragraph, a number of assertions are made - and I agree with the sentiments in them - but what's the evidence. The paper would benefit by embedding some of its claims a little bit more carefully in the evidence that backs them up or not - in other words, soften some of the assertive style.

3. Is the age criterion always a problem and in every instance, for every child? The paper does not really say anything about this and children with profound impairments seem to be treated as 'undifferentiated' in relation to how the care regimes, based on age, operate. I'd like to see some engagement with my observation here.

Overall, this is a good paper and it should be published.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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