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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript, in which the authors share results of a review of five documents related to reporting on Thailand's progress toward implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and identify various inconsistencies between the reports and highlight identified implementation gaps. Although this manuscript would make an important and unique contribution to our field, it would require significant revisions before I could recommend publication. I will detail these below.

Method:

- It is important for the authors to provide much greater detail in their methods section so that reviewers can properly assess the rigor of the study. For example, on p. 4 the authors note that reports were "reviewed against" other reports. How was this done? Did you have a process for coding or an organizational system for analyzing the documents? What was the theoretical framework for this review? Who completed the actual document analysis (how many people)? Did you have processes to validate findings and ensure consistency among multiple researchers? Again, with the information provided in this section, it is difficult for me to make an informed judgement about study methods.

Findings:

- Before getting into what the documents did or did not contain, it would be useful for the authors to provide a brief summary or overview of each of the documents reviewed to provide context. For example, how long was each document? What was the structure and/or tone of the documents? What were the key messages of documents? A simple overview of the documents reviewed would help the reader to better contextualize the findings that you present.

- It might be useful to provide direct page numbers to the sections of each document discussed so that a reader might easily refer back to a given section.
- With results just in narrative form, it is hard for a reader to keep the different findings for the different documents organized conceptually. A Table that clearly organizes and summarizes the key findings for each document could be very useful.

- I would caution the authors from providing researcher opinion in the findings section. For example, on p. 6, the authors note "Lack of clarity on these critical Articles related to human rights suggests major implementation gaps". These sorts of reflections and commentary belong in the discussion, not results.

- Some of the points made in monitoring and evaluation seem to require more context. For example, it might make sense that statistics change between data reported in 2007 and data reported in 2015 - both because population might change over time, and because definitions of disability could evolve over time and impact how people with disabilities are "counted". It is not really meaningful to note that two different reports provided two different numbers if we don't have greater clarity about what the reports were measuring and where/how they got their data. Perhaps equally interesting would have been reports about the methods through which data were collected to arrive at the conflicting figures - you could then engage with this in a critical way in the discussion.

- Under "major factual discrepancies", the description about the legal amendment process was unclear. It is hard to understand what you are trying to say here. Consider revising.

Discussion:

- On p. 9, the authors argue that the data they present show that the government has a "poor attitude". I do not believe that they have presented the data that would enable them to make this statement. Rather, one might argue that the government has shown a clear commitment to the rights of people with disabilities through the ratification of the CRPD and the attempt to align national policy - this is a great positive step. Rather, discrepancies in the reports demonstrate areas for improvement or areas that need increased support for monitoring and implementation, or targeted attention. If the ultimate goal of doing this study is to get the government to increase national support for the rights of people with disabilities, rather than condemn the government, you might consider taking a strengths based approach and highlight specific areas for improvement and detail specific action that could be taken.
Overall:

- I found the extensive use of acronyms to be confusing and distracting. Although the authors provide a list of acronyms at the end, I would suggest that if possible, and particularly when the acronyms only appear once or twice in the manuscript, they use the full words. This will minimize confusion or the need to flip back and forth between the text and acronym list. Additionally, the acronyms NHRCT or DTH were not written in their entirety the first time they were used.

- There are many English language errors in this manuscript, indicating that it was writing by non-native speakers. I would strongly suggest that the authors hire an external English proofreader to fix grammatical and stylistic issues.

- State party is written with both lowercase and capital. The capitalization should be consistent throughout.
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