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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors

Thank you for your e-mail sent Tues 16/09/2014 04:03 requesting some changes to our submitted manuscript (MS: 1531774574142471) prior to editorial assessment. Details of these changes are as follows:

1. As requested, I have added line numbers to the main text file and removed page breaks.

2. No changes made. Our manuscript is submitted to the Debates section of BMC Public Health and presents an argument that is not essentially based on practical research. Ethical approval is therefore not applicable to this manuscript. Nor are there any relevant reporting standards, nor supporting data.

3. No changes made. Our manuscript presents an argument that is not essentially based on practical research and does not report a study involving human (or other) participants. It is submitted to the Debates section of BMC Public Health and therefore does not have a Methods section. A consent statement is therefore not applicable to this manuscript. We have read, and attempted to ensure that our manuscript complies with, all of the journal's editorial policies.

4. No changes made. Our manuscript does not include any abbreviations.

Please do not hesitate to contact me again if anything further is required to allow our manuscript to proceed to editorial assessment.

Yours sincerely, Ian Shemilt.