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Reviewer's report:

Overall, I thought this was a nice paper. Very clear and convincing overall. Obviously, we always want a larger N, but I think this is acceptable for a Master's thesis and can be a good example for those wishing to carry out similar research. However, there are a few things I would like to see fixed before it moves to publication, although I think the general substance is there.

Major Comments:

Main text:

After this whole introduction of the WFG (up to line 92), I don't understand the substance of this policy -- why is its development in particular important to study? Was it particularly difficult to pass or fraught/controversial? Or is this just an example of any old policy and the idea isn't about the policy itself but rather how policies of any kind are passed in Wales? If the latter, why is this one a good example to demonstrate?

I think you should spend a bit more time convincing your reader that Kingdon's theory is the right framework. You mention complexity (lines 120-22), but you also admit that other theories (e.g. Sabatier) are also complex. So why Kingdon in particular? Also, lines 206-8... you mention analysis led you to use Kingon's model. So was this framework chosen after data collection/analysis or had you planned to use it all along?

I like the results section overall, most of the evidence is quite convincing. However, I don't get a sense of how much pushback there might have been (apart from the WWF) or how difficult this was to pass. Was its difficulty more or less than other similar kinds of policies? It didn't seem particularly challenging, but it's just not clear.
Quote on pg 19 (lines 330-40) - very interesting, but what I really want to know is how did this change impact its ability to pass in legislature?

Minor Comments:

Title: The title of this article is too long, really. Suggest shortening (remove Kingdon), perhaps to something like "Taking the long view: the Development of the Well-bring of Future Generations (Wales) Act" (or something like that)

Abstract: The Background section doesn't actually discuss what the study itself will be about, only about the WFG. So this doesn't hook you the way it should.

Line 94, you say "one size fits all" doesn't work but then at the end of that paragraph (98-11), you say that your study can inform future policy, but this is contradictory. What are the caveats?

The paper could use a light language/grammar touch-up. I noticed some typos (misplaced commas, e.g.) and things like lines 151-152 and lines 611-613 are not complete sentences. Also, on line 502, "hadn't of" is not English, it's "hand't've" or "hadn't have" (had not have)

You mention document review but basically all of the evidence used in the results are from interviews. How did you use your documentary evidence? Does this include news sources?

Lines 367-70: What evidence (besides the quote above) do you have that it had this effect (i.e. that the closure of the commission led to a broad focusing of support in Welsh politicians)? Was it a one woman show here with Jane pushing or was this Wales-wide?
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