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Review Comments

**Reviewer 1**

I think this is certainly a very important paper, and extremely topical. This is exactly what the core debates of medical ethics are about. In that sense, it puts a finger on an important pulse. I think however, that it needs to be constructed better to be more effective. It needs proper editing. It needs to be divested of jargon- both the jargon of the medical discourse, and the jargon of the social sciences. It also needs a more elaborate discussion of both the clinical dilemma and the choices. It also needs a deeper excavation of motive. For example, it is not clear to me why the therapists disinclination for referral to an in-patient facility is not reflective also of a sense of failure on the part of the therapist. The author(s) may also want to consider larger systemic ethic as a possibility- that is the nature of the conversation between the client, the family, the therapist and the in-patient team? Should we be thinking about that? Would our focus on our micro-decision be helped by a larger understanding?

I apologise for the level of detail- but I think that this is a particularly important paper, and that to make its point better, it may need to be constructed better.

**Reviewer 2**

1. The paper, though on a relevant subject, would need to be meaningfully re-written; it takes a while to grasp the central point of the paper - it seems they are talking about the tension between humanitarianism and professionalism in medical practice and this apparent tension is discussed with a case study in psychiatric care.

2. In the initial sections the paper tries to draw out some history of humanitarianism and professionalism - but there is no detailed engagement with the history/concepts of these two schools of thought (if they can be called that). For the first time reader especially, it will be difficult to appreciate the argument. There are portions of the paper where arguments are only supported by reference, whereas it is essential to take up some level of detailing.

For eg: When the authors say - “A good example of this could be the one explained by humanitarian advocate Michael Ignatieff(14).” Neither does reference 14 doesn’t directly deal with Ignatieff, nor do the authors expand on what might be Michael Ignatieff’s explanation. This is just one example.

3. The purported solution - "professional humanitarian" is also not arrived at well - it may seem like the favourable middle ground to occupy. And so in the conclusion generalisations appear such as - "A professional relief worker is essentially virtuous, and interestingly, it boils down to these virtues which lay down ethical standards in morally complex circumstances." However, the solution itself is arrived at through one case study alone. The limitations of this has not been addressed.