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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Please remove the separate 'Objective' section in the Abstract or include it as a part of the Background.

RESPONSE: DONE

2. Please only provide three to ten keywords representing the main content of the article.

RESPONSE: THE NUMBER OF KEYWORDS IS NOW REDUCED TO 10.

3. In order to adhere to submission guideline, please rename the section heading 'Introduction' to 'Background'
4. In order to adhere to submission guideline, please provide Results and Discussion as two separate sections following the following instructions. Please also remove the sentence 'Since the results of this overview are not exclusively empirical, but also argumentative and normative, results and discussion are joined in the same section' from the main text.

Results

This should include the findings of the study including, if appropriate, results of statistical analysis which must be included either in the text or as tables and figures.

Discussion

This section should discuss the implications of the findings in context of existing research and highlight limitations of the study.

RESPONSE: WE WERE A BIT SKEPTICAL TO THIS SUGGESTION, SINCE IT SEEMS TO REST ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THIS IS A TRADITIONAL EMPIRICAL PAPER WHERE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ARE EASILY SEPARABLE. IN THE CASE OF ARGUMENT-FOCUSED PAPERS, THIS DISTINCTION, IN OUR VIEW, BECOMES QUITE ARBITRARY (THERE ARE, FOR GOOD REASONS, NEVER ANY DISCUSSION SECTION IN THE PAPERS OF PURELY PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNALS, SINCE THE ENTIRE PAPER IS THE DISCUSSION WHILE AT THE SAME TIME MAKING UP THE RESULTS). HOWEVER, BEARING THIS CRITICISM IN MIND, WE HAVE NEVERTHELESS TRIED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENT, AT LEAST TO SOME EXTENT. WE THINK THAT THE PAPER IN ITS PRESENT FORM IS MORE APPEALING TO THE READER, WITHOUT INVOLVING ANY SACRIFICE TO CONTENT OR STRINGENCY.

5. List of Abbreviations

As abbreviations are used throughout the paper, we ask that you include a list of abbreviations (before the declarations section) for reference and ease of reading. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.

RESPONSE: SUCH A LIST IS ADDED WHERE SUGGESTED.

6. Please rename 'Ethics approval' to 'Ethics approval and consent to participate'

RESPONSE: DONE.

7. Please represent authors’ names using their full initials, not their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section. Please note each author must be specified in this section.
For example: ‘AB carried out the molecular genetic studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. BC participated in the design of the study, carried out immunoassays and performed the statistical analysis. CD conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

RESPONSE: NO CHANGE NEEDED TO FULFILL THIS REQUIREMENT.

8. Please remove 'SBU FASD Summary in English.pdf' from the file inventory as it is for peer review and not necessary at this stage of submission

RESPONSE: THIS WILL BE DONE WHEN RESUBMITTING.

9. Upon resubmission, Please remove any tracked changes. If you wish to respond to these revision requests, please insert the information into the designated input box only.

RESPONSE: DONE.