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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a potentially useful paper, with a broadly pedagogical aim.

------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors should present the chi-square and degrees of freedom for the measurement model, the final model, and the null model. The RMSR might also be useful.

The incremental fit indices do not show good fit for the structural equation model - the authors might like to comment on that.

Were the variables categorised for the LLM? This should be described and the loss of information justified, perhaps with reference to previous published research which has used this approach.

------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Figure 2 seems to imply that all latent variables were uncorrelated - this is not the case. (Adding in these paths would make the diagram a little messy, so perhaps this could be added.)

------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

If I were going to be pedantic, I would suggest that the umlauts be added to Jöreskog and Sörbom.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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