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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very well written report of a Delphi study to develop a consensus definition of child assent to research participation.

This is an important topic because no consensus definition of child assent is available to researchers.

The authors appear to have been very successful in achieving their study objective, and the resulting definition of child assent will likely be an important contribution to the research ethics literature.

After having read the manuscript very carefully, I have no significant recommendations to the editor or authors to improve this manuscript, and I recommend it be published without revision. I note that this is, among the 200 or more articles I have reviewed over the past 30 years or so, this is the only manuscript for which I have not had any recommendations for revising the manuscript.

If published, I will even consider using this article as an example of a Delphi study and an example of an ethics empirical study in teaching my graduate and postdoctoral students.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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