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Reviewer's report:

In general, the manuscript is well structured and readable. It begins with a brief introduction into the RDS meta-model and then leads over to the thereof derived claim that scientists have the (moral) obligation to promote human wellbeing. In the main part of the manuscript, the author provides a series of examples that put this claim into question or rather show the limits of this claim, among them examples for the potential harm of well-intended interventions, such as unforeseen effects of development-aid measures or side effects of medical interventions. Starting from these evident examples, the author substantiates the idea that "benefits and detriments" are inseparably intertwined in (almost) every type of intervention, even though the downsides of interventions are often hardly evident at first glance. In this context, the author enlarges upon positive-negative trade-offs in medical and psychological interventions. It is argued that negative side effects are often less evident and thus less considered - but just as existent - in psychological interventions compared to medical interventions.

I think that the present manuscript is an interesting and worth reading contribution to the field. By way of qualifying that, though, I would like to mention that I am an experimental psychologist mainly engaged in fundamental perceptual research. Thus, the topic of the present manuscript is at least partly outside my area of expertise.

I have just one minor remark:

Typo in line 38 on page 13: "psychological" should read 'psychology' or 'psychological research'.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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