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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper again. I am pleased to see significant changes made throughout. I appreciate the time you have taken to thoroughly deal with the issues raised. I think the paper is much better for it.

There are just a few minor essential revisions that are needed:

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".

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?

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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...".

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