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Welcome to this issue of the *Journal of Solution-Focused Brief Therapy*.

Steve de Shazer had some clear ideas about what was — and wasn’t — to be regarded as Solution-Focused Brief Therapy and they offered a "definition", including four defining aspects of the approach de Shazer and Berg (1997). More recently, Trepper et al. (2012) have offered a "manual" for Solution-Focused Brief Therapy. These publications represent a continuum of Solution-Focused orthodoxy, with development and evolution over time. Others have suggested that, now that the SFBT founders are no longer with us, it is almost "anything goes" under the Solution-Focused heading — a position against which I argued recently (Durrant, 2016).

In the world of computer software, we are used to incremental and evolutionary upgrades which are contrasted with the (often more rare) major version upgrades.

Mark McKergow — whilst clearly not a supporter of the view that Solution-Focused is whatever you want it to be — suggests that there has been such a major version upgrade to Solution-Focused practice and that it is important to be clear about these changes. Thus, he suggests what he terms *SFBT 2.0* and outlines what he sees as these major developments and changes in emphasis.

Whilst Solution-Focus is not the same as a focus on strengths and/or on resilience, all three share a common theoretical and philosophical tendency to focus on people’s success and ways of coping rather than on people’s deficiencies or pathology. Research in the area of resilience is important to us because it adds support for the broader philosophical standpoint from which Solution-Focused comes. Thus, I am pleased that this issue of the journal includes two significant research papers relating to measures of resilience in
children and young people, and using *The Resilience Doughnut* — an Australian model for conceptualising resilience (Worsley, 2011).

Our interview this issue is with David Hains, a mental health nurse in Adelaide, South Australia who has pioneered the use of SFBT within the mental health Emergency Department setting. David coordinated the recent Australian and New Zealand Solution-Focused Conference in Adelaide, which was a successful culmination (so far) of David’s Solution-Focused journey in Adelaide.

One of the key factors leading to the decision to establish this journal was the recognition of the importance of having an academic-standard, peer-reviewed journal of Solution-Focused practice. At the same time, both the members of the Editorial Board and the publishers (the Board of the Australasian Association for Solution-Focused Brief Therapy) recognise that many of our readers are primarily practitioners. Thus, we seek to juggle academic and practice emphases.

In this issue, we introduce a new, occasional feature, the *Forum*. In this section, something published online or in a niche publication — which might raise interesting or even contentious ideas about SFBT — will be reprinted and two or three people invited to write comments. In this first *Forum*, Evan George has some thoughts (originally posted online) about words ... and how we should be aware (or beware) of them. Our three invited commenters all — unfortunately — agree with Evan’s thoughts but offer some interesting thoughts of their own. We hope you find this new feature useful, and we will be including other, more practice-based features in coming issues.
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