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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written and very interesting paper reporting a replication study in an Indian context with young Hindu adults, replicating a study published in 2011 with young Austrian adults with Catholic upbringing. A such, I strongly recommend its publication, after making use of my following observations and suggestions which hopefully add even more value to this paper.

1. All through your paper, like in 2011, you speak of mood pathology, while the participants are NOT patients in a clinical setting. Rather, as in l. 173, it is more adequate to speak of "psychiatric burden" in the dimensions of the BSI.
This should be stated more explicitly, and therefore questions the title of the paper. l. 314 you state that maybe even you have an un-representative high amount of healthy participants (cf. also next point: sampling).
Cf. only in l. 314: additional studies in clinical settings are needed, as is also stated in the 2011 paper.

2. Please report your sampling more transparently:
l. 149-150: how did you get the sample of N=541? What was the return rate?
l. 188: In the results, you say 443 participants completed all parts. This means that 98 questionnaires were excluded. Any ideas for the difficulties of the participants to complete them?

3. Results

3a: l. 219 you report: "In addition, lower RSWB was also related to an increased amount of mood pathology (r = -.15, p &lt; .01)."
This correlation is actually only marginal / negligible and should be stated as such (or omitted). Without this clarification (or omission), readers who are not familiar with these statistical values might be misled.
(Actually, not every statistically significant result is also a meaningful result to be reported beyond the tables.)

3b: l. 234 you report: "RWB was unrelated to all dimensions of mood pathology."
How do you interpret this result? It should be discussed more (than you do in the discussion part where you only repeat the statement/ result without further reflecting it) in the light of the theoretical model of Kirkpatrick and Granqvist you seem to subscribe to (cf. introduction). To which extent could it question or confirm their affirmations and differentiations of theory (cf. e.g. Granqvist et al. 2010 Religion as Attachment: Normative Processes and Individual Differences. Personality and Social Psychology Review 14/1:49-59. Granqvist 2010 Religion as Attachment: The Godin Award Lecture. Archive for the
4. Discussion

Your discussion is concise and very much to the point, maybe even presupposing concepts (esp. e.g. correspondence and compensation pathway) unfamiliar to readers who are not familiar with Granqvist's work. Why not add one or two sentences to explain them and make your discussion more intelligible to them?

5. Limitations and Conclusion

The limitations are put very well and the conclusions are both plausible as well as positively humble, deserving attention and reception in the scientific community.

One element could be added. You state the limitation of the presumed connection between attachment and spirituality:

1. 309-311: Regarding attachment, our assessment of the current attachment style - although largely based on past experiences [48] - might not be as strong a predictor of spirituality.

This could be part of the problem of self-reports in questionnaires, esp. as to Religion/ Spirituality. Cf. Granqvist 2010, 20, agreeing to Wulff 2006. (Again, the above remarks on the sampling get salient).

Hopefully you can make constructive use of these observations either integrating or discussing them. Looking forward to seeing your research paper published soon - kind regards
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