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Reviewer's report:

This paper presents an exploration of the extent to which empirical ethics research could facilitate development of our theoretical understanding of illness and disease. It draws upon a wide range of literature, and attempt to show how a bridge between them can air conceptual development in this area, and in this I believe it makes an interesting contribution to the literature on both the concept of disease and illness and, to a lesser extent, on empirical ethics. I say to lesser extent, because I feel the paper could do more to emphasise the learning points for empirical ethics, but I do not feel this is necessary in order for it to be publishable.

This submission has been substantially revised in light of previous reviews. Looking at the paper as it now stands, I feel that it does make an interesting and important contribution to the literature and is publishable.

However, whilst the written English is acceptable, and I am loath to criticise anyone writing in a second language (because I certainly could not), it is sometimes unclear and would benefit from substantial copyediting and proofreading, to improve the readability. Much of the phrasing is quite convoluted, and refinement to the written expression of the paper would lead to much greater clarity in the argument.

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.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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