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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed many of my concerns.

Major Compulsory Revisions

It appears that your a priori model was the 6-factor solution determined through EFA of your other sample. However, you describe a 5-factor model, and then mention in passing that there was a sixth factor that you discarded. As a reader, I need to understand your original hypothesized model, how it fit or didn’t fit your data, and the steps / additional analyses you undertook to establish a well-fitting model. If you indeed originally tested a 6-factor model, you need to describe all 6 scales in your methods section and include the 6th factor in your statistical analysis section. Then in your results section, you can explain that the 6-factor solution fit the data poorly, etc., and you decided to discard it and run a 5-factor model. Then describe the 5-factor model and those results. In the discussion section, explain your reasons for discarding the sixth factor (as well as the additional items you eliminated - as you already have explained).

Minor Essential Revisions

I see that you have engaged an editorial service. Please utilize this resource to improve the readability of your paper.

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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