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Reviewer's report:

COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

First, I want to thank to you,

I've reviewed, “The Construct Validity and reliability of the Turkish Version of Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale

In my opinion, the article as it currently stands does not meet a sufficient high enough standard of research methodology or scholarly writing for the BMC Public Health

I therefore recommend that the article be reconsidered for future publication following revision.

I think that the paper as it stands need major revision.

Best Regards

MAJOR ISSUES

May I suggest that the authors consider making the following amendments:

What significant contribution does this study have to make to the literature. What is new here. This should be clarify

Methods:
- The study survey giving a 67.5% response rate. #s there sufficient this response rate?

This situation, be described as limited its investigation, the reasons must be specified in method.

- The participants: There is no mention of the inclusion/exclusion criteria for the study. What was the criteria for the exclusion and included for samples?. The author(s) should described them as the rationale for her/him exclusion and included criteria for samples. Sampling method is not clear, Some information on how the sample was selected would be useful.

- how the sample numbers was determined.

Measurement
Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale

Why was the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale selected for a target instrument in this study? Should be explored this scale, how many items were included,

It is unclear what is the clinical significance of Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale. For example what was the mean high score? Good or bad?

Validity Study

This study, what was not used content validity and language validity. What was used only construct validity. At study should include this.

*Construct validity

What was the results of Barlett’s. What were the results of the diagnostic test for sampling adequacy.

Reliability

What was not used each item analysis and internal consistency of the Spreitzer’s Psychological Empowerment Scale. Only for subscale used internal consistency and test could be re test reliability but not done.

Tables 1:
in Table 1 not included Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. It Includes only the average and standard error. In this section, are there deficiencies in writing? or are there error/deficiencies in Table 1. This situation must be corrected.

I will be more than happy to review the paper again once these comments have been taken into consideration.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.