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Author’s response to reviews:

I thank the reviewer and editor for their comments and have addressed each of them, as laid out below.

1) Page 3, before the Main text. I think you need something along the lines of "In order to add to the debate, I proceed by way of presenting some reasons based on this perspective".

This has been done

2) Page 4, line 62. "An option list, usually up to 26..." Are you sure about this? Can you provide a reference? Why usually 26?

This has been altered to “5 to more than 25” and referenced to Case and Swanson.

3) Page 4, line 67. I think this should read "should align with" or "should align to" clinical practice.

This has been corrected

4) Page 4, line 68 - "option sin" should be "options in"

This has been changed.

5) Page 4, line 72 - "...might be part of a made up of..." - repair this phrase.

This group of sentences has been repaired.

6) Page 4, line 75 - "As an example, for with..." - repair this phrase.
This has been repaired.

7) Page 4, lines 73-74 - I'm not a huge fan of rhetorical questions. But if you are going to use them, please use a question mark.

This sentence has been reworded and is no longer a rhetorical question.

8) Page 5, line 93 - I'd add the word "plausible" before combinations of elements.

This has been done.

Some further discretionary revisions:

1) page 2, line 27. In the abstract, I appreciate that you have toned this down 'It is time to consider a move too...' but I still think it needs something earlier in this sentence along the lines of "In contexts that are appropriate...".

This has been done.

2) I think "can not" should be "cannot" throughout.

This has been done.