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Reviewer’s report:

Please number your comments and divide them into

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Much of the language in the results section would traditionally be used in the discussion. There are sentences which, while based on the results of the study, are more judgmental in nature, and hence, should be included in the discussion section of the paper. For example. On page 5, “However, the internal consistency of the scales as evinced by Cronbach’s alpha do not instill great confidence in these findings” is not necessary. The following sentence reporting ‘Only two of the subscales manifest an alpha exceeding 0.7’ is sufficient.

While the structure of the subscales was not confirmed in the factor analysis, the ‘rule of thumb’ that reliability should be 0.7 or above is just that – a general guideline.

In the results section, it is sufficient to report that 17 of the 50 items ‘manifest fit indices of less than 0.7’ without the phrase ‘A large number of items in the DREEM do not appear to fit the model well’.

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

An additional article was published on the psychometric characteristics of the DREEM in 2011(1) that should be included (along with the Greek and Portuguese references). This should be useful because the authors of that paper found a different DREEM structure as well.

I wondered whether the authors would like to speculate on possible reasons for the difference in the results they obtained, since, as they already pointed out, the survey was not translated to another language and the underlying factor structure was based on ‘theoretical reasoning’. Are there differences between the graduate entry students and those in their final year? Are there specific areas for additional research that the researchers recommend (beyond the ‘basic psychometric appraisal’)?

2011;33(5):e267-274.

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

There is an additional reference regarding use of the DREEM(2), and the authors can add the references if they like.
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