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**Reviewer's report:**

Fist at all, I well know this manuscript because I reviewed it several months ago for an other journal.

I found that this article was written professionally and was agree for its publication.

Most of my previous comments have been included in this current version. Consequently, I have very few more comments.

1-The paper presents psychometric properties of Chinese version of PPS in a worker-based study. It has a great practical value for Chinese-speaking researchers and practitioners.

2-All the analysis are performed and discussed correctly.

3-The data sound

4- Discussion and conclusions are well balanced. I recently published a similar paper in a worker population-based study and found an important inter factors correlation (Lesage FX., Berjot S. Deschamps F. Psychometric properties of the French version of the Perceived Stress Scale. Int J Occup Med Env Health. 2012;25(2):1-7). The context may transform a factorial structure, and there are very few publications about the psychometric properties of the PSS in a working sample.

However, given that I'm the reviewer, this reference may unfortunately not be used, even if it would be useful.

6- Limitations: ok

7- The authors have added the Leung's work as I recommended it.

8- Title and abstract: ok

9- Writing: ok

Others comments:

Minor revisions

In results chapter:
“Factor 1 was composed of the 6 negatively worded items and factor 2 was composed of the 4 negatively worded items” : there is a little mistake. The items are not all negatively worded.

Discretionary revisions
The authors concluded to a stable two factor structure “in this context”. But how the questionnaire have to be used? Is it correct or acceptable to sum the two factors? Have the two scores to be used separately ?

**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.
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