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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your submission. I hope my review is helpful in developing this paper forward.

1. I am not convinced that the question posed by your team is well defined in terms of alternative models suggested. The paper is well written with an acceptable title but it is not really an argument but more a description and some discussion. A new proposed model without a strong evidence base to suggest it is then proposed. I did wonder instead if this could be a narrative review as clearly the team has undertaken a wide/comprehensive search. Some update is required like Noyes reference (See now Fraser et al). To clearly show that a review strategy and synthesis of work would help this paper to be more well defined. A number of models can then be shared for real debate. The team do use useful reporting methods but this could be enhanced to be a really exciting paper. This would balance the discussion and critical edge more to this paper.

2. The methods of searching for evidence are not clearly defined and data quality trail not evident but could be as I have suggested in Point 1.

3. The writing style is a real strength hence I have not rejected the article but asked for re-consideration. It flows well and could be developed further. There are some minor tensions around using some terms like 'Persons' (Page 3 for example) and 'These children'.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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