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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting, theory-based study. My comments follow:

1. It is not useful to put the Hypothesis numbers in the abstract. They are not meaningful to a reader.

2. I find the "risk-loving" and "risk-averse" terms confusing when used with regulatory focus theory. To best of my knowledge, regulatory focus theory doesn't use those terms, so it is confusing when the authors start to use them. Particularly in the hypotheses section where you say "risk-loving patients with a promotion focus" - this is confusing, and at best redundant. Are there risk-loving patients without a promotion focus? I think you need to simplify how you talk about this, most particularly getting rid of "risk-loving" and "risk-averse".

3. On p. 7, lines 20 and 52, you refer to individuals with a prevention focus "always" doing something. You can't say that individuals always behave in a certain way.

4. Methods sections generally start off talking about participants and procedures.

5. Data analysis section should be in the Methods section, not the results.

6. The Methods and Results sections are generally not structured. I would suggest you find some other articles to model these after.

7. I would strongly suggest a native English speaker helping you with this paper.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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