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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thanks a lot for giving us the opportunity to further improve our manuscript. This reads as follows:

1. The indicated corresponding author as provided in the manuscript does not match the information as provided in the editorial manager system. Please amend this.
   ◊OK. We are giving now full contact information of the corresponding author in the paper.

2. Please move the abbreviations to after the conclusions and before the declarations.
   ◊OK.

3. In the ethics and consent for participation section, please clarify if the consent for participation was written informed consent.
   ◊OK. It is “Written informed consent”.

4. The individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Currently the contributions of EA are not described. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here: http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship
   ◊OK.
   This section reads now as follows:
   “HU, MHR, EA and SK conceptualized the work. SK acquired the data. MHR analyzed and interpreted the data. MHR drafted the article. HU supervised the analysis and interpretation of data and revised the article. EA proof read the manuscript. All authors gave their consent for publication.”
5. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

Lines 256-261, 318-324:

Hiebler-Ragger, Michaela, et al. "Facets of spirituality diminish the positive relationship between insecure attachment and mood pathology in young adults." PloS one 11.6 (2016). While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. If there is overlap in the Methods section, please ensure to summarize the methods and cite the source. Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.

OK. We have now shortened the Methods section and refer to the first study for a more extensive description. The section now reads as follows:

“In replication of the previous study [11], were a more extensive description of the psychometric assessment can be found, the following standardized self-report questionnaires were applied: The Experience in Close Relationships - Revised (ECR-RD) [39] measures ‘Avoidant Attachment’ (AV) and ‘Anxious Attachment’ (AX) with 36 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale. The Multidimensional Inventory for Religious/Spiritual Well-being (MI-RSWB) [40] measures Existential Well-Being (EWB), Religious Well-Being (RWB) and a total scale of Religious/Spiritual Well-Being (RSWB). The 48 items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale. To date, the MI-RSWB has already been extensively applied in studies of different clinical as well as healthy populations [35]. The Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (BSI-18) [42] measures the mood-related psychiatric burden (Anxiety, Somatization and Depression) for the preceding seven days with 18 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Overall, the Global Severity Index (GSI) can be generated.”