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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this manuscript. The authors incorporated the essential and necessary changes in their review. Nevertheless some minor points still remain.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Minor Essential Revisions

1.) I would recommend adding a limitation section within the discussion. This section could include the following ideas: “Major limitations of this article are that we situate our approaches within the socioeconomic and cultural context of Kenya. However, we believe that our ethical considerations and approaches provide an important starting point for any researcher to use as a framework for ethical research with street-connected children and youth within low- and middle-income settings. While our exact approaches may not the applicable in other countries, our new Key Recommendations setting provides suggestions that can be adapted and applied in any setting.” In addition, the authors might mention further considerations such as potential issues (payments etc.) in the “bases/barracks” between leaders, older youths and younger children on the streets including their approach to prevent these issues from interfering with research.

2.) The authors mention on page 8, line 230, that mabaraza are a traditional form of community assembly in East Africa. However, I am not sure if that expression and the form of traditional assembly is common in all countries of Eastern Africa. Hence a more conservative description might be more accurate.

3.) The authors described the community members with whom they conducted the mabaraza as “living in these locations”. Adding information about their status within the community might be helpful.

Discretionary Revisions

1.) Explaining the informal consent procedure in the response letter helped me better understanding the process. I would like to suggest to the authors to include their definition in the manuscript.
2.) page 6, line 172 and line 181: I suggest rephrasing the last sentence of the respective paragraph. I would suggest “Additional details on study methods are available in the respective publications.” instead of “can be found elsewhere”.

3.) Page 7, line 195: I would suggest indicating to the reader how the key categories and the guiding principles are interrelated. Maybe, writing “The here-with associated guiding principles…” instead of “The guiding principles…” would highlight this interrelation.
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