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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

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

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

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

The authors are to be congratulated on their very thorough and comprehensive revision of the manuscript in line with the recommendations.

I have only some very minor comments, 1/ for binary data it may be more appropriate to speak of tetrachoric rather than polychoric, 2/I am not a big fan of least significant differences post hoc test, as it can be too liberal.

SPSS has many such tests, suggest quickly ascertaining what the currently recommended post hoc test is (it used to be the Scheffe), or use modified lsd (similar to Bonferroni but used post hoc), and see if the results still ok. This should not take more than 1 day to find recent book or paper and rerun the analyses just to make sure that results are also found using conservative method.

Otherwise, congratulations on an excellent paper!
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Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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