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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have done a good job and have responded to the feedback provided. This is an interesting study, with interesting findings. My only concern is that they tested whether the wellness and illness focused groupings (as Jensen had originally suggested) as adequate based on the relative associations of the subscales. The two groupings were not meant to reflect associations among the scales and how they cluster with each other, as much as associations of the scales with measures of functioning. That is, a group of would still be considered as “maladaptive” or “illness-focused” because they lead to bad outcomes, even if their association with each other is negligible. So their taking a look at how the scales might cluster or not cluster together based on the nature of associations between the scales is interesting, and provides ideas about possible over-arching domains. But such analyses do not speak to how the scales should be clustered along the "families" of illness-focused or wellness-focused.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I would suggest that the authors re-write their discussion on the subject discussed under "general comment" to make it clear that the fact that the scales did not cluster clearly along the two families does not mean that it is not useful to think of particular coping responses as being either maladaptive/illness-focused or adaptive/wellness-focused; that the decision about relative adaptiveness has to do with how the scales predict and contribute (or take away from) functioning, and very little, if anything, about how they scales relate to each other.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No