

## Comments up until the end of Chapter One

Here is my view of what you should be trying to do with these revisions, and why. If you submit a soft-bound revised thesis, it will be sent back to the original examiners (assuming they are willing to re-examine it). When they read it, they will want to see that you have taken notice of their suggestions and used them to improve the thesis. I think you have improved it, but not enough. The first section below consists of suggestions about what else you need to do in response to the examiners; the second section addresses a few issues in the abstract, acknowledgements and intro (things I think your changes have made worse); the third section lists typos and clumsy phrasings that it would be good to fix if you have time but which aren't crucial.

I'm calling the NZ examiner "Ex 1" and the overseas examiner "Ex 2".

There may be further comments on this once I've read to the end of the thesis, since part of what's important is whether you've done enough here to make sense of what you do later.

### *1. Responding to the examiners*

- Ex 1's first detailed comment about Ch 1: they give you a few options, and in your earlier notes on the examiners' reports you said the option you were taking was to improve signposting. You have done so in 1.1.1; 1.1.2 seems to me adequately signposted; 1.1.3 could use signposting, along the lines (as you've done in 1.1.1) of explaining why you're talking about this.

DONE: ADDED TO END OF SECTION: 'Now we have the idea of religious leaders as sources of authority where they are able to differentiate the disabled from non-disabled in virtue of their access to the will of God'.

- Section 1.2. Ex 1 makes a comment on this, and you gave a response to it in your earlier notes, but you haven't changed this section. Suggest you include the examiner's comment in some form like "One might think...", and then give your response to it.

DONE: ADDED: 'For example, syphilis is caused by a spirochete bacteria – rather than being caused by sin or being caused by the wrath of God as punishment for sin'. The examiner has a quote from a literary novel - *Erewhon*, Samuel Butler, 1960). The novel is a satire and I do not wish to engage in interpretation of a satiric novel. I referenced Murphy who has a Chapter on how various people are trying to develop Psychiatry '*In the Scientific Image*'.

In the next section 'Social Model' I have altered the first sentence: 'In the previous section we considered the medical model as being narrowly focused on proximal, typically lower level causes.'

- Ex 1 says that sections 1.3.1 – 1.3.4 make claims that need supporting evidence but lack references.

**SIGNIFICANTLY REVISED 1.3.1 PUBLIC HEALTH** Rewritten to reference textbooks on Public Health, Epidemiology, Health Promotion. Discussion about how these notions have been thought to be related.

- You haven't addressed this. Here are some of the claims I think they have in mind: - p11. "Most practicing clinicians say..."; "Sometimes public health is characterised as being health promotion"; "Sometimes public health is defined as being the same as epidemiology" – Either reword these, or give a reference to back each of them up. Also: p12: "People don't deny that deaf people can't hear, but they do deny that this must inevitably result..."; Tried to get rid of 'people' and instead 'one might say' sort of a thing – a quick google shows that people say this but it is the \*idea\* that is relevant p13, "The disability rights movement advocates that..."; p16, "...are often thought to be given a life sentence...". I expect you see the pattern – these are all places where you say that people say things or think things but don't give any evidence that they do. I think most of this has been addressed with the rewrite.
- On public health and epidemiology and health promotion, just googling "Is public health the same thing as epidemiology?" makes it clear that many people don't think so – but all you need to do to address this is add references as suggested above, since you only say "Sometimes...". Yeah, I did that.
- You have an answer (in the notes you sent earlier) to Ex 1's comment about 1.3.4. and the relation between the social and the medical model, but you haven't incorporated it in your revisions. As a careful reader (Ex 1 clearly is one) has misunderstood something here, you need to think about how to make it clearer. (Perhaps one way is something like I suggested regarding 1.2, above.) My thesis does state clearly that the medical model (strictly conceived) is focused on biophysical, biochemical, physiological causes.
- P19. Ex 1's comment "explain what you mean by 'discrimination'" – I think this is an example of what Ex 2 is getting at with their slightly garbled comment about your use of "discrimination" - see our recent email exchange about this – and I think you should address it. The point is, I think, that here it sounds as though you might think that *any* choosing between people is discriminatory in the morally problematic sense. DEFENCE: In paragraph 6 of this section ('an alternative to DALYs criteria is a consideration of what issues are clinically relevant...') I talk about how we can discriminate between people on the basis of *clinically relevant* considerations. It is therefore clear that I do not think that all discrimination is bad or morally problematic. It isn't clear that this example of choosing between people on DALYS grounds is choosing on irrelevant grounds, so it isn't clear that it's morally problematic. DEFENCE It is clear to me that discriminating against people on the basis that they have disability *when their disability is not clinically relevant* is not acceptable (the example I give in paragraph 6 include discriminating against people who are deaf for heart or liver transplant *solely on the basis of their being deaf*). I really do not understand their problem. I'm not

defending this view, just saying that you should address it, since the examiners are worried about it.

- **DONE** P19: Ex2 suggests that you delete your anecdotal “60 students say” sentence, and it seems to me that doing so would be no loss.

## 2. Abstract, acknowledgments and intro

- **CHANGE** - “I will show that this is required in order for the social institution of medicine to be sustainable” In the abstract, the second sentence of para 2 doesn’t make sense: instead, “I will show that this is required in order for the Medical Institution to be sustainable.”
- However, in that same sentence, and depending on whether you define carefully what you mean by “the Medical Institution” later in the thesis, I think it would be better to say “the various medical institutions”, so as not to sound like a conspiracy theorist. (This is Tim’s suggestion: I balked at your turn of phrase and ran it past him, and he agreed that most readers won’t know what you mean by “The Medical Institution”, and some of those who do will be alienated by the choice of term. If you’re not intending to just preach to the choir, it would be good to change it.) **Hope the above change fixes it.**
- **DONE** In the Acknowledgements section, the first added sentence thanking the examiners is good. But I think you should stop there – nothing that follows belongs in an acknowledgements section.
- **DONE** I think the rest of that paragraph should simply be deleted – in my view, the examiners gave appropriately detailed comments for an MPhil, did not have in mind that you were upgrading to a PhD, and might reasonably be insulted by what you say here, as it implies that they did not do the job they were asked to do.
- The following paragraph: I would delete the bits about the examination process, **DONE** move the bit about your intentions regarding what kind of work this is to the introduction, **MOVE DONE** and expand upon it. **THE FIRST 3 PARAGRAPHS OF THE INTO HAVE BEEN UPDATED** Setting out what you’re doing and how you are going about it is part of the thesis proper – reading it is necessary to understanding what comes later – and the acknowledgements section is something that in general people feel free to skip.
- **DONE** The paragraph about the MPhil: this is a more measured version of some of the emails you’ve been sending, and I think it has no place here – you should delete it and develop it into something else (e.g. a calm and considered letter to the VC and Kay Weaver, pointing out the issue about the MPhil being half a PhD but only being allocated a third as much time).
- In the intro, there was previously a first paragraph explaining the overall project, and I think you need to reintroduce a version of it.
- At the end of the intro, I think you should insert a version of the “intentions” bit from the acknowledgements. But I would leave out the last sentence from that para of the acknowledgements. I don’t think it’s okay to say that the reader can return to the abstract if they get lost along the way **DONE** – it’s your job to make sure they don’t get lost. If you can’t bring the reader along with you, you’re not making the connections between sections clear enough. Note Ex 2’s comment

about being able to follow why a transition between topics is happening and the overall direction of travel of the thesis. I get the impression you think this is a minor worry, but it isn't: if the reader can't see why you're telling them what you're telling them, they are not going to stay engaged.

#### *Minor things*

- **DONE** Intro line 2, “disability”
- **The UN ideology leading into the WHO view on disability will provide us with an account of disability...** Intro page 2, beginning of second full para: “This ideology” and “This account of disability” – could make it clearer what these refer back to. “The UN’s ideology”? “The WHO’s account of disability”?
- **DONE (deleted comma)** P4, first full sentence: either delete comma after “better” or keep it and add another comma after “fuller”.
- **DONE (added ‘why’)** P6, final sentence of 1.1.1. (and, good that you added this sentence): suggest “In this section I have considered how disability might be linked to difference and how (or why?) difference might not necessarily be bad for the group.”
- **DONE** P7, first sentence of first full para, delete comma after “allowing”.
- **DONE** P12, first sentence, should there be a “disabled” between “international” and “people’s”?
- **DONE ‘can help people feel as though their distress of problems are legitimated’.** 1.3.4, first sentence of second para sounds very informal, perhaps instead: “..can help people feel that [or “as though”]their distress or problems are legitimated.” (Take out “somehow”, change “feel like”.)
- **DONE ‘This might be thought to be empowering insofar as it served the interests of the people, but disempowering insofar as it did so only coincidentally on the doctor choosing to advocate for the patient’s interests rather than their own.’** p15. Last sentence of page, not sure why I didn’t pick this up before, “rather than the people having the interests they had” doesn’t quite make sense – would be good to rephrase it.