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In this letter, we would like to respond to a recent paper that was published in this journal by De Leeuw and Peters (2014). In their contribution, the authors recommend to use the political and policy literature more productively to explain the development of Health in All Policies (HiAP). For the HiAP context, they regard the application of behavioral constructs to explain political phenomena (such as HiAP) as a scholarly sin, stating that the behavioral perspective is ‘asking the wrong question, and deploying an inappropriate inquiry system’. In a similar context, however, we (Hendriks \textit{et al.}, 2013b) intentionally use a behavioral science perspective, because, in our view, each HiAP development initially requires an organizational behavior change on the part of certain policy actors.

We agree with De Leeuw and Peters (2014) that HiAP barriers are often intrinsically political in nature, but also see that many HiAP barriers are related to behavior change. We therefore propose a better integration of political science with behavioral science, to obtain a more comprehensive approach on HiAP. Therefore, we will first briefly outline how both author teams have operationalized their scientific perspective.

To assist HiAP developers, De Leeuw and Peters (2014) developed a HiAP checklist from a political and policy science perspective. This checklist incorporates nine core questions related to the following HiAP themes: (i) defining or redefining the problem, (ii) evaluating existing policy, (iii) gathering information, (iv) establishing the policy logic based on social determinants, (v) developing alternatives with stakeholders, (vi) trading off costs and benefits, (vii) constructing a matrix of power, interest and priority, (viii) considering political strategy, and (ix) describing and planning implementation. These themes are incorporated in ‘core questions’ that are meant to be answered by HiAP developers and ‘show the practicalities of applying a health political science view to integral policy making’. The authors argue that answering these core questions can guide the formulation, negotiation, development and implementation of HiAP, because this leads to a more thorough understanding of the complexity of HiAP development (De Leeuw and Peters, 2014).

For the same purpose, we (Hendriks \textit{et al.}, 2013b) developed the Behavior Change Ball (BCB) as a broad conceptual HiAP framework. The framework incorporates
We recognize forces outside the governmental organization by positioning the BCB in an attractor landscape, but do not directly describe concepts that govern this landscape. Integrating De Leeuw and Peters’ nine core questions into the BCB’s landscape seems to provide additional and useful content for the BCB’s environment. This seems especially appealing since the most optimal HiAP perspective probably depends on the specific ‘HiAP issue’ at hand. In other words, not one but both perspectives might be useful to attain the goal of both author teams: ‘to achieve a more thorough understanding of the complexity of HiAP’. For example, the development of HiAP in Fiji seems to be hampered by World Trade Organization agreements limiting the Fijian government in restricting the imports of unhealthy foods (Thow et al., 2010). Since this issue is more political in nature, De Leeuw and Peters’ angle seems more appropriate to grasp why the development of HiAP might be stagnating. On the other hand, in one of our cases [i.e. a Dutch municipal organization (A.-M. Hendriks et al., submitted for publication)], policy makers resisted changes to their working routines and did not have the skills to collaborate across sectors, hampering the development of HiAP. In view of the organizational nature of this HiAP barrier, our behavioral approach (i.e. examining OBs) seems to be most appropriate. Finally, it might also be useful to combine both perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives might be useful to attain the goal of both author teams: ‘to achieve a more thorough understanding of the complexity of HiAP’. For example, the development of HiAP in Fiji seems to be hampered by World Trade Organization agreements limiting the Fijian government in restricting the imports of unhealthy foods (Thow et al., 2010). Since this issue is more political in nature, De Leeuw and Peters’ angle seems more appropriate to grasp why the development of HiAP might be stagnating. On the other hand, in one of our cases [i.e. a Dutch municipal organization (A.-M. Hendriks et al., submitted for publication)], policy makers resisted changes to their working routines and did not have the skills to collaborate across sectors, hampering the development of HiAP. In view of the organizational nature of this HiAP barrier, our behavioral approach (i.e. examining OBs) seems to be most appropriate. Finally, it might also be useful to combine both perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP. For example, understanding a HiAP issue perspectives in working toward interventions to promote effective HiAP.

To conclude, we feel that future attempts to explain HiAP development should integrate political and behavioral science perspectives better and thereby apply a more comprehensive approach to understand HiAP. Instead of emphasizing one’s own perspective, we advocate that experts in HiAP should put effort in integrative, holistic, systems perspectives. Viewing different scientific angles as additives rather than competitors may lead to new insights that take HiAP developments a step further.
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