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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the effort of authors they devoted to the revision and their justification of the proposed statistical analysis, but I still do not agree with the idea to present regression analysis separately for each decision-making style. The authors argue that it is the only way to assess its role separately from other styles (and controlling the effect of other variables as education...) and that it is the question they are interested in. I have two concerns with this:

1. Firstly, it is important to find the reason for this question - why do we need to assess each style separately and avoid analysing them together? They are always together in individual and, as even their intercorrelation in the current study show, are interrelated. Their mutual role should surely be investigated.

2. If authors are really very interested in the association of each decision-making style with CRC, it can easily be done by correlation (point biserial correlation) - "ordinary", "zero-order" correlations firstly, partial correlations to control for education and HL.

My second point is about the originality of the article. It can be found on VU site (https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/89585949/chapter+6%3A+Decision-making+styles.pdf), so the authors need to explain if it is only working paper, or published chapter (it is named Chapter 6)? In the second case, the study should not be published.

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

No

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

Yes

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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