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Reviewer's report:

The paper attempts to establish the psychometric validity of a dementia knowledge questionnaire. Overall it is well structured and well written, with an adequate justification as to why the study may be of interest. There are, however, some comments on confirmatory factor analysis which are at least debateable but these largely stem from the previous use of principal component analysis. In the view of many PCA is not a good starting point for analysis and also there are good reasons to believe that its results will not always be supported by CFA. I think the authors should acknowledge this, even though in this case the CFA largely supports the PCA.

I would also argue that instead of considering a four correlated factors solution it makes sense to also consider a bi-factor solution in which there is a general factor on which all items load and then four other factors. This should further be supported by the calculation of omega and omega h for the factors rather than the use of Cronbach’s alpha. See McDonald and Revelle among others for reasons for using omega rather than Cronbach.

I think it also makes sense to make it easier to see what the items are and their pattern of correlation. Perhaps it is only in my version but there were very sporadic details of both the scoring of the items and their content. There was more detail on items that did not fit than those that did.

Lastly I think it would be useful to have detail on the breakdown of gender and dementia care, so that we can see how representative the sample is, and this might be true for other classifications.
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