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"STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?

Yes - overall design, population, and control groups are appropriate

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?

Yes - methodologies are adequate and well implemented, assumptions are addressed, analysis is robust

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?

No - there are minor issues

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?

Yes - interpretation accurately reflects analyses, limitations/bias are acknowledged, accurate descriptors are used

Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution?
Probably - with minor revisions

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:
This is a much improved version of the paper. However, there are still a few areas that require attention.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
1. Page 3, line 6 implies that family relationships affect diagnosis or treatment. They may affect compliance with treatment or acceptance of the diagnosis, but they do not affect diagnosis or treatment.
2. The pleasure principle was not ""overthrown"" by regulator focus theory. It was ""replaced"" by this and many other theories.
3. Page 10, line 13: this should be ""<0.05,"" not ""0.000 < 0.05"
4. In Table 3, delete the lines with chi-squared, df, and probability level; keep the others.
5. There is much in the data analysis section that really belongs in the Results section (e.g., alphas, correlations among measures, etc.).
6. This may be difficult to fit on the page, but Figure 2 should have the actual path coefficients in order for the reader to see the results.
7. Wording difficulties:
Page 4, line 38 -- confidence of patients ""with"" or ""in"" their physicians, not ""on"" their physicians.
Page 4, line 45 -- add 'because they ""are dissatisfied or discontented"" with their physicians'
Page 4, line 49 -- must add 'object ""to their patients seeking other information"" because ...'
Page 10, line 35 -- confirmatory factor analysis, not confirmative factor analysis"

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.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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