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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper - the introduction covers relevant research in sufficient detail, and the authors convincingly make the case for the present study. My only concerns relate to the execution and reporting of analyses.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Provide criteria for evaluation of model fit (CFA). Although the authors suggest that the CFA was successful, there is no evidence provided for the reader to discern this for him/herself. At a bare minimum, a CFA should include chi square, p value for chi square, CFI, RMSEA, and potentially SRMR values as well. Up-to-date cut-offs for these should be explicated so that the reader can determine whether the model fits the data.

2. Similarly, it is unclear whether the CFA has an orthogonal structure (factors are unrelated), oblique structure (correlated factors), or whether a bi-factor approach is tested, whereby a global factor + factors for each of the sub scales is tested (see Gignac's work for details on bifactor models).


3. Furthermore, it would be useful to provide a table of factor loadings from the CFA. The reliability estimates and item-total correlation scores are less useful as the total score in these calculations conflates measurement error and true score variance, whereas the CFA separates these appropriately.

4. There is a similar lack of explanation of criteria to determine whether the reported correlations establish convergent and construct validity. What is a sufficient correlation size to confidently claim evidence of validity?

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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