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Reviewer's report:

I have had the opportunity to yet again review “Factor structure and psychometric properties of the Trier Inventory for Chronic Stress (TICS) in a cross-sectional, representative German survey”. And again, the authors have made a sincere effort to address my concerns. I have no major compulsory revisions, only a few minor essential revisions.

(page, line number)
2,6 This CHRONIC STRESS can be
2,8 and [no “to”] evaluate
2, 24, and heuristically can be grouped
4, 15 no e.g. before pregnancy, confusing sentence otherwise
4, 18 This cover demands that a person has towards the... That statements makes no sense, what cover? I'd suggest deleting the sentence so that it reads “via employing the available internal or external resources [15]. Resources might be [of] ecological, societal, occupations, OR private nature.
5, 6 In accordance WITH the SYSTEMIC REQUIREMENT – RESOURCE MODEL, these NINE factors can be grouped into High Demands REFERING TO specific...
5, 16 Can the authors give an example of a non-representative sample? I’m still not clear on what is meant by non-representative?
5,24 by “superior, do the authors mean higher order?
5,27 However, it IS not yet .... Groups DIFFER also
6,2 Recent findings... measurement invariance may be absent --- absent for what?
7,1 The data collection was conducted [delete “within a representative”] by the ‘USUMA’ polling...
7,4 The participants [delete “were interviewed in their homes, at which time they”] filled out the questionnaires IN THEIR HOMES.
7,21 I'm not sure what Arbeitskries Deutscher etc. is there for?
8,9 The participants RATED all
9,15 AND Root Mean Square...
9, 18 SDCS test?
9,20 FOR THE ANOVAs testing --- within is confusing because there are within and between subject ANOVAs.
10,14 no exclusive rule on a confidence interval that is… I don’t understand. The tradition is that if it is less than 1, then it is not a factor. Otherwise, why stop at .88?
10, 15 The determination of the factor number IS also based on…
11, 1 Factor six, [delete “an”] equivalent to…
11, 18, delete “both”
11,22 I’m not sure why RMSEA should take precedence over all other model fit indices? I’ve never heard of that view. A reference would be helpful.
14, 17 Both factors EXPLAINED MERELY 17% of THE variance (in what?)
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**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.