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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to reviewers’ comments

Reviewer reports:

Heather Aldersey (Reviewer 1):

This manuscript is greatly improved. I particularly appreciate the contextual information related to disability and policy in Thailand, as well as the descriptions of the documents reviewed.

I appreciate the inclusion of a Findings table, however, I found this table quite complex and confusing and would suggest that the authors simplify and clarify. Some ideas for how they might do this would be to align their headings in the findings section with those of the table columns.

Authors might also consider ways to make the table more intuitive so that a reader wouldn't need to extensively study a legend to understand it. For example, the different entries under measures/activities (NPEPD, NP, /, x) were hard to follow. Also, the words seemed out of place and confusing under Monitoring results, Alt.

Ans: The table is adjusted. Different symbols are reduced as much as possible.

Moreover, why are Measures/Activities and Future Plan not broken out by Gov and Alt like the rest of the columns?
Ans: Information on Future Plan column is added and separated in Gov/Alt. However, since the alternative reports are produced by those with main responsibility in monitoring and evaluation, not the implementers themselves, they barely contain information regarding measures/activities. Alternative reports prioritize in criticizing on the implemented measures/activities which are reported by the primary implementer, i.e., the government agencies.

Why do you measure Monitoring/Results at Output/Outcome for the Government Report but not Alt report?

Ans: Definition of the level of ‘Monitor & Evaluation’ in the finding table is adapted in order to use the same symbol in both government and alternative reports.

I believe that if the authors revise the findings table to present results in a clear, easy-to-understand way, it will help them to organize their findings section in the manuscript in a way that makes more sense to the reader as well. Consistency between what is presented in the narrative and what is organized in a table would be very helpful.

Ans: The headings in the narrative are adjusted to be as close as possible to those in the table. There are still 2 differences as follows,

o In the ‘Plan’ part, as indicated in method, there are two components to be extracted which are legal compliance and clear focal points for implementation. The implementation focal points are not shown in the table because information explained in each article was not clear and verification is difficult to track. However, this issue is discussed extensively in Article 33 (National implementation and monitoring) in every report. So I explain it in text instead of putting the confusing information in Table. This is also added as limitation.

o The Future plan, as the ‘Act’ part, is shown in Table but not a distinct heading in narrated finding because the information is clear by quantitative results shown in Table. Few lines of narrative are explained at the end of ‘Monitoring & Evaluation’ part in the finding.

I would also suggest that the authors reflect on the limitations of their work in the study discussion section.

Ans: Limitation is added at the end of discussion section.
Finally, although this manuscript is starting to come together conceptually and methodologically, the grammatical errors and writing style in this manuscript are so distracting that it makes it hard to make an accurate assessment on the quality of the work. I cannot recommend this for publication until the significant writing problems are rectified.

Ans: The current version is already proofread by the native speaker reviewer.

=================================

Parul Bakhshi (Reviewer 2): The authors have done extensive revision to the previous draft by clarifying and developing ideas and their interconnections. The figures and tables help visualize the analysis in a very reader friendly manner.

I think that there is a need to have the language reviewed for grammar and expressions.

Ans: The current version is already proofread by the native speaker reviewer.

In order to move towards a final draft there are some key comments:

Keywords: include "Thailand" and "Disability Policy"

Ans: Keywords are added as suggested.

References: The list of references primarily contains UN reports and commentaries as well as grey literature. There is a lack of academic research data on disability in Thailand. It will be important to demonstrate a review of the literature. Opportunities for including research can be found throughout the paper (ie: references to the medical versus social model of disability—there is only one reference for this 15).

Ans: References are added as suggested.

Background: pages 3-4: the section on "Disability in Thailand" the section that has been added brings more clarity to the argument. However, the section remains descriptive with regards to the PDEA and then moves to the CRPD (line 51 p3) abruptly. Some sentences that clarify the circumstances and influences that led to the ratification of the CRPD would help with understanding the background.

Ans: Some additional information is added.
Findings: (p6) Overview of the 5 documents: It would be important to clarify the criteria for which these 5 documents were chosen for analysis.

Findings: (p6 line 55 to p10 line 17): It would be helpful to briefly state again how the "compliance" was determined. In methods authors refer to content analysis, however how this analysis was applied to conclude on the findings needs to be clarified more in the text. The "monitoring and evaluation section" needs more inputs with regards to gathering data for accountability on one hand and building an evidence-base for improving implementation on the other.

Ans:

- The five documents are officially reports with comprehensive information on the CRPD implementation which are currently considered most reliable sources of information. Hence, they are used instead of tracking Ministries’ report piece by piece. Clarification is added in the Method part.

- Since the extraction rely mostly from the five documents, compliance is determined by the statement in the report whether they considered the current laws in Thailand comply with CRPD or not. Some further probe to verify the law was performed if the statement in the reports were not clear. Some discussions are added on the disagreement on ‘compliance’ between the State Report and Alternative reports.

- The criteria of data extraction are added. The finding table is adjusted according to the criteria to ease the understanding.

Discussion: The arguments in this section are well articulated. (p 11, line 38-45) The issue of "internalization of CRPD principles across officials" seems to be a key point towards sustainable policy implementation. In this paragraph the inclusion of PWD in policy decisions is stated, however, some additional information with regards to what the dynamics is towards operating this change in official mentality would be interesting.

Conclusion: the idea put forth in the abstract "implementation research can provide evidence for further effective implementation", however, in view of the analysis, what opportunities can be supported to build the "evidence base"?

Ans: Discussion was added on the issue of strength of DPO in driving CRPD agenda. Higher capacity of DPO in technical and academic issue would also bring about the opportunity for more evidence-based input to the implementation.