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Reviewer's report:

The authors have clearly worked hard to address the concerns raised with the previous version of this manuscript. Just a few issues that need to be addressed in a revision remain. Specifically, the following need attention:

1. On page 5, lines 89-91, it is indicated that the sample size was adequate according to the guidelines of 5-10 participants per item. This is in fact only a very crude guideline that cannot be relied on as it does not take into account the complexity of the model, the distributional characteristics of the data, missing data, or the reliability of the scales. For this purpose, the methods introduced by Muthen and Muthen (2002) need to be used to assess the adequacy of the sample claimed in this study.

2. On page 8, line 158, it is indicated that an item with a CVI (content validity of item) above .8 can be considered valid. While this index may be popular in nursing research, it is not commonly accepted in the general psychometric literature as it provides little validity information. Content validity refers to the degree to which instrument's components adequately represent a construct of interest. Content validity in just a conceptual test or a qualitative type of validity declaration that cannot really be quantified (Crocker & Algina, 1986). The commonly reported CVI is based on ratings of item relevance by content experts. It is generally computed by dividing the number of expert judges issuing a rating of 3 or 4 on the corresponding Likert scale by the total number of judges. However, if other content experts are used, if a different number of experts are used, or if a different rating is used, then these reported values may change significantly. As this study was intended to validate the factor structure of an existing and well-established scale, these controversial details are not really informative or needed.

3. On page 11, line 207, it is indicated that the "...scale's internal consistency and homogeneity were assessed by Cronbach's alpha". This statement should be referring to the internal consistency of the subscales, given that as indicated in my previous review, "reporting a total Cronbach's alpha does not make sense when the scale is multidimensional".

4. On page 13, line 260, it is indicated that "the internal consistency analysis of the 35 items showed that the mean values range from 4.47 … to 5.25". What does this mean? Internal consistency is a measure that ranges from 0 to 1, so it is not clear what exactly these reported values are referring to in the study. Also, Table 2 provides the factor loadings, so I'm not sure why it is being referenced here.
5. On page 15, lines 302-305, the goodness of fit criteria that are reported are suggesting poor model fit (GFI = .83, TLI = .80). Only the CFI = .93 is suggesting adequate fit and this reported value does not actually make sense. All fit criteria commonly reported in CFA and SEM type analyses are based on an evaluation of a discrepancy function (i.e., the difference between the sample implied covariance matrix and the model implied covariance matrix). While all fit criteria are not expected to provide identical fit values, as each considers the discrepancy function from a slightly different perspective, computed fit values would not normally fluctuate to the same degree as those reported in this study.

6. (Minor issue) On page 18, line 350, the name of the reviewer is given in the main body of the manuscript. This is not common in scholarly articles and should either be removed or given in a footnote.
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