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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsary Revisions

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question is clearly stated, but the aim and objectives of the paper and the whole approach should be more detailed and more precisely defined. The contributions of the paper could be made more explicit.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are appropriate, not too complex and fairly described.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion is not deep enough; the advantages of the regret theory approach are not clearly stated. A quality and quantity of life as well as modern cognitive theories are mentioned but it is not clear how the authors approach are incorporating them, nor is it clear why using the regret theory approach is better than DCA or other decision making paradigms, which should also be included for comparison in the paper. The conclusion is very narrative.

Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Not at all.

Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
The state of the art review is entirely missing. The list of references is quite extensive, but most of the references are not cited in the paper.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes the abstract is well written, but the title could be made more informative.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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