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The manuscript "Success/failure condition influences attribution of control, negative affect, and shame among patients with Depression in Singapore" examined differences in attributional style, negative affect, and shame following random assignment to a "success" condition or a "failure" condition in individuals with depression (n = 72) and healthy controls (n = 73). The study focuses on examining differences in patterns of attributional style and negative affect in an Asian sample, to extend our largely Western knowledge-base in this area. This is a novel experimental design and an interesting, clinically relevant study.

The authors have sufficiently addressed the reviewer comments to the original submission. I provide just one final suggestion below.

Thank you for addressing my minor comment suggesting you use the word "condition" in place of "outcome" when describing the success vs. failure experimental condition that participants were randomly assigned to. However, the authors also changed this term in other instances throughout the paper, when not referring to the experiment (e.g., on page 5, paragraph 1, "they may also view positive [outcomes/conditions] as uncontrollable…"). In instances where the term "outcome" did not refer to the experimental condition that participants were in, it makes more sense to leave this term as "outcome."
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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