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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide further revisions to the manuscript. We are pleased that you feel that the revisions made thus far have strengthen the submission.

Reviewer reports:

We really appreciate the revisions you have made which strengthen the submission.

We need to be mindful that, with an international readership, we need to be very clear about terminology and would welcome brief clarification about the meaning of ‘value’, which is after all in your title.

For instance, the sentence in the abstract, “They rate themselves as feeling similarly knowledgeable, confident, supported and valued,” could be interpreted as either:

- They feel they are held in similarly high regard
- They feel they hold similar principles or standards of behaviour
- They are recompensed to a similar extent.
Thank you for clarifying this point. We have tried to clarify what we mean by the term ‘value’ in the abstract (p3, line 48 – 52), where we now state: “They value (find worthwhile) youth and adult involvement work to a similarly high extent, but feel their institutions may regard youth involvement slightly less highly than adult involvement. ECRs rate themselves as feeling similarly knowledgeable, confident and supported when doing involvement activities with both age groups”.

We have also noted in the method section that we did not define any of the terminology used in the questions presented to respondents. We also state more clearly our intended interpretation of the term ‘value’ and acknowledge that some respondents may have had a different interpretation. We now state (p. 10, lines 229 – 235): “We did not provide respondents with definitions of any of the terms used in the questions. For instance, we did not define what was meant by the word ‘value’ in the questions asking the extent to which the respondents/their organisation/their department value youth/adult involvement. We anticipate that our respondents understood the use of the term ‘value’ as meaning ‘held in high regard’/’seen of worthwhile pursuit’, although it is possible that other interpretations (e.g. regarding monetary worth, or principles and beliefs held) were applied”.