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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Team.

MINOR REVISIONS

Thank you and well done.

I think this has improved alot. I would have liked more debate in the summary section with regards to the point of critically unpicking some of the issues.

If you do have more words allowed (to discuss with the editor) you could really add to the debate in this section. That said it is an excellent taster debate paper that I am sure is much needed and on that I am happy to accept it.

One aspect I am still unsure about is the concept of terminology especially around using 'children' singularly as a concept. I think you were unsure about what I meant in my first review so I will try to explain more and apologies for that. In the UK we use the social model of disability and refer to 'children and young people' usually in all our documents/articles. Here I noticed you use children and then are using the word adolescent in the key words but its not mentioned again in the article. In the UK we tend to use the word adolescent for sick children or in the paediatric model (used by paediatricians in the main). In the majority of our articles we use children and young people.

I also noticed that in your feedback you do say young people but in the article largely say 'children'. I think your article would be strengthened by using throughout 'children and young people'. Removing adolescent in the key words and replacing it also with children and young people. It may be this is the UK perspective I hold of course but I am sure it will have wider applicability and is more fitting for the context you refer to.

I note you have not changed 'These chiildren' on page 3 and questioned what I meant. Apologies again and its perhaps style but it reads as slightly labelling and not the model I am used to seeing. I would suggest 'This group of children and young people' ....Thats really all I meant and I do apologise for not being clear.

In your endnotes I think ageing is not spelt correctly.

All other aspects have been addressed from my first review and its so much stronger on models and updated references. I am happy to accept. I hope my feedback is useful.
Thank you.
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