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Reviewer’s report:

‘Frequency of Positive States of Mind as a moderator of the effects of stress on psychological functioning and perceived health’ is greatly improved. As mentioned previously, the research has many notable strengths, including its sample and sample size, and the relative simplicity of the design (using a cross-sectional design but with reference to time periods that imply temporal precedence). However, there are still several minor points I would like to see addressed more thoroughly before this piece is published.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. As mentioned in my initial review, the health measure that was used as an outcome is only 2 items long and measures perceived health, vs. actual health. It is conceivable that perceived health could be affected by positive affect in ways that are very different from the relationships between positive affect and actual health outcomes. I appreciate your mention of the measure’s validity (and the associated reference), but again, given the centrality of this measure, I would prefer a few more words about its validity (what sort of validity? as compared to what?) in the measure-description. In addition, I think the fact that the health-measure was of perceived health (vs. actual health) should be mentioned in the discussion – as a limitation and/or future direction (future research could examine the impact of positive states of mind on symptom-counts, for example). This comment could fit at the end of the second-to-last paragraph.

2. Bottom of page 9: “restore recourses” should be “restore resources”.

3. p. 10: “described by Moskowitz et al. (Moskowitz, Hult et al. 2011)” seems redundant, in terms of citations.

4. p. 10: “the study also highlight” should read “the study also highlights”.

5. p. 10 (same sentence as above): “to increased” should read “to increase”.

Again, I feel that this manuscript is greatly improved and appreciate the authors’ attention to reviewers’ comments.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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