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**Author’s response to reviews:**

(1) The author notes he is unsure whether to specify the Conceptual ACT Theory as a specific psychological constructionist approach, but is happy to do so. I think reviewer #1 is correct that this would be worth doing, both to ensure it is clear for interested readers and because it helps connects these ideas to other contributions to the special issue (e.g., I would characterize the dynamical systems approach that Dr. Hayes will be discussing as a constructionist approach).

--The revised manuscript now specifies the Conceptual ACT Theory on page 10, line 10.

(2) In my initial viewing of the ambiguous figure, it looked to me like a picture of someone punching a kitten. From a brief review of this portion of the manuscript, I don't think the content is the point here, so any image similarly manipulated could be used to the same end. I would recommend choosing a different image or, if the content is important, making that much more explicit in the figure caption.

--I appreciate this comment. I have now removed Figures 2 and 3 and references to these figures. This example would be helpful if executed with a properly ambiguous picture, but it is ultimately redundant with non-pictorial examples in the manuscript and it is difficult to determine whether a broad audience would find a particular image to be ambiguous. Accordingly, the best course of action seemed to be removing this image-based example and focusing instead on text-based explanations. Thank you!