

Thank you and the reviewers again for your time for providing additional feedback on our manuscript.

I have included a revised manuscript (attached), with edits recognized via track changes. Please find below a summary of changes, based on the additional suggestions:

- The introductory paragraph of the literature review section needs revision to clearly indicate that this section offers a comprehensive overview of the relevant literature on the topic.
 - *The following sentence has been added to the introductory paragraph: **To follow is a brief overview of the relevant literature related to several of these alternatives**, to include the solidarity economy (Kawano, 2017; Kawano and Matthaei, 2020; Kawano, 2021) and cooperative commonwealths therein (Gordon Nembhard, 2021; Restakis, 2021, 2022); well-being economy (Fioramonti, 2021); doughnut economics (Raworth, 2017); transitional, plentitude economy (Schor, 2011); and community economies (Gibson-Graham, 2006; Gibson-Graham, Cameron & Healy, 2013).*

- It [introductory paragraph] should also provide a smooth transition for the reader into the following paragraphs.
 - *I have included subheadings throughout the introductory section to guide the reader.*

- Additionally, the literature review should be one to two pages long and may include two to three other subtopics, possibly incorporating some of the original subtopics.
 - *I have edited the introductory section to reduce its length, and, as noted above, included subheadings to guide the reader.*

- Before the "Implications for Practice" section, the author should ensure that additional subtopics are included. Currently, the article goes from "Literature Review" to the "Implications for Practice".
 - *As noted above, subheadings have been included throughout the literature review section.*

- Overall, the article is well written and has significant potential; with some restructuring, its readability can be greatly improved.
 - *Thank you.*