1. The specific aims of the authors were to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Health Regulatory Focus Scale (HRFS), and normative data for 2,510 adults "of the German general population." The HRFS is composed of seven (7) items with two dimensions, health promotion focus (5 items) and health prevention focus (2 items). Each item is scaled using a 7-point level of agreement. Using the R statistical packages, the authors conducted two main analyses. Measurement invariance (MI) was undertaken for age and gender. McDonald's coefficient-omega was used to obtain estimates of internal consistency for scores on the dimensions.

2. The strengths of the study are as follows: The manuscript is brief [approximately 16 pages], and it addresses basic psychometric properties for a self-report instrument. Also, the sample size is large, which is considered adequate for each of the analyses undertaken. Moreover, the analytic data methods are relevant.

The limitations for consideration are as follows:

3. The manuscript should be edited carefully for spelling and grammatical errors.

4. In order to place a sample size of 2,510 in perspectives, it is crucial to report detailed demographic information for the general German population. An alternative approach might be to report these data in the form of descriptive statistics for the study sample.

5. When reporting coefficient-omega for scores on study instruments, it is essential to include the related 95% confidence interval (CI).
6. Most contemporary psychometricians would be concerned about a dimension of an instrument that is composed of only two (2) items within structural equation modeling. The minimum expected for clinical utility is three items. Also, there is limited information about the steps that were adopted either in the construction or adoption of the instrument for use in German populations.

7. The latent mean analysis is generally undertaken, after reporting the results of the MI analysis; this was not done in this study. This issue is to be addressed before undertaking the search for normative information.

8. Last, by no means the least, a reader might ask how a factor-analytic study contributes to the understanding of the nomological net for any instrument. Specifically, the lack of concurrent validation data [i.e., convergent and discriminant validity] makes it hard to appreciate the differential dimensions for the HRFS. It might be helpful to include scores on at least one validation instrument.
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