

Dear Reviewers, Thank you for Review our manuscript, hope that the correction is accepted. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

I have tried to add more analysis using the procedural justice theory in two places: 1) I added an additional paragraph in the procedural justice theory sub-section in the literature review and 2) I added more analysis using this theory in the discussion.

I have responded to each individual comment and explained how I addressed each.

I agree, I have added citations throughout the paper that were not included in the original draft. I have responded to each individual comment by the reviewer to show where I added citations that were lacking previously.

This is a good comment. I realized that I had back to back sentences that were repetitive. I have now consolidated this to one sentence with the Laniyonu & Goff citation.

A description has been added in the introduction.

I have changed this wording and added a reference as well.

I have removed this sentence and tried to reframe that paragraph.

I have described this better now in the third paragraph of the introduction section.

I have tried to address this by moving the procedural justice sub-section earlier in the literature review and being more explicit about it in the introduction.

I have taken this sentence out because upon review, it did not work well as the transition sentence. I have added a citation here.

In the 'law enforcement approaches' section, I have added a citation for all of the statements that need support. Please let me know if I missed any but I think they are all covered.

I now have cited Donnelly et al., 2024 in the sentence "The co-responder model can potentially reduce the burden on the healthcare and justice systems."

I have rephrased this sentence, as well as other references like this, to appear more neutral than the original draft.

I agree. I have moved this section to the beginning of the literature review.

That is a good point. I have added a citation to this sentence. I have added other outcomes that would be improved through a procedural justice approach.

I have made the methods section a standalone section. I have no included far more information on how I did the study so it can be replicated.

This is a good point. I have rephrased it just being a review instead of a systematic review.

I understand this would be good but it would make the manuscript far too long. I think focusing on the summarized categories is the best way to go for this article.

The analysis using procedural justice framework is in the discussion. I reserved the results section for the categories of legislative approaches and then analyzed those categories through the framework in the discussion. I can change this if needed.

I have reframed the discussion quite a bit to better align with the results, consider the limitations of these approaches, and tie in existing literature to show the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches.

This is a good point. I have corrected the abstract and manuscript to remove this.

I have made these changes. I separated the sub-topics into a standalone literature review section. I have then added a paragraph to the introduction to make it more comprehensive.

I have separated the methods and results section into a standalone methods section and standalone results section. I then added a paragraph to the methods section to address this concern.

I have added many more sources to the article. I have also updated the sources to include more modern sources. For every citation that previously had an outdated citation, I have included a newer citation when possible.