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Dear Dr Byrne,

Thank you for the opportunity to improve upon, and resubmit, my manuscript entitled “A New Conception and Subsequent Taxonomy of Clinical Psychological Problems” upon receiving feedback from reviewer Dr Bo Bach.

I note that Dr Bach’s response has been very positive, but that he has recommended three important enhancements/additions to the paper. I have happily acted on all three valuable suggestions. These changes have been highlighted (via Track Changes) in the accompanying manuscript. They are:

1) Dr Bach makes the important point that the new conception and taxonomy are complementary to DSM-5 and ICD-11, and that I have unnecessarily contrasted the professions of psychiatry and clinical psychology by sometimes referring to “psychiatric” conditions, problems, or disorders. I have therefore taken his advice in replacing all such references with the term “psychopathological” (except where the reference is specifically to the profession of psychiatry) or simply with “mental disorders”.

This has been done: In the Abstract on page 1; And on pages 6 (twice), 9 (twice), 11, 13 (twice), 14, 15, 20, 23, 29, 30 (including a heading), 31, 34, 37 (twice), 39, 40, Appendix B (page 65), and in Table 2.

2) Dr Bach points to the paper’s frequent references to DSM-5 but only occasional references to ICD-10, and, due to its recency, none to ICD-11. The reason for this is its recency. Dr Bach is clearly at the forefront of these developments. But the new dimensional aspects of ICD-11 make it most relevant to PMC theory, so it is fitting that this paper include such latest developments.

Therefore I have researched the recent 2018, 2019, and ‘in press’ literature Dr Bach has pointed me to, and have included the relevant ICD-11 developments on pages 2, 4, 8, 9, and 33.
3) Dr Bach makes the same point with regard to contributions from the HiTOP consortium. The paper had made some reference to this, but not as much as its importance and relevance to PMC theory would warrant. He gave a very recent (in press) reference.

I have therefore caught some of these recent developments, and summarized and linked them to PMC theory on pages 11, 12, 16, 34, and 35.

Other recent findings and citations relevant to the new conception and taxonomy emerged in the course of these researches. They have led to changes or additions on pages 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 33, 35, and to the Reference list.