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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1. Over the past decade or more there have been a considerable number of criticisms of Berry's four-strategy approach to acculturation measurement, as well as conceptual concerns about issues such as the use of the word 'strategies'. See, for example, various critiques by Rudmin. A number of researchers have argued that bidimensional approaches to acculturation measurement are preferable to the four-strategy approach. On the other hand, the widespread use of Berry's approach, the considerable theoretical literature in its favour, and its use in recent years as part of large-scale acculturation studies, might serve to justify the use of the four-strategy approach. Either way, the authors should position their work within this literature and, in light of this literature, provide arguments to support the approach they have chosen to take.

2. Interestingly, given the above, it seems that the authors have taken an acculturation measure that was not meant to be scored in either a two-dimension or four-strategy manner, successfully re-scored it in a bidimensional way, and then used these two dimensions to derive four strategies. It appears that the four strategies have been derived by conducting median splits on the two dimensions, and then classifying participants into one of the four resulting quadrants. Confusingly, the authors claim that their approach results in four 'scales' (e.g., page 9). Berry's original method indeed results in four actual scales -- he most often has a separate dimensional measure of each of his four strategies. There is precedent for median splits of bidimensional measures, but this approach is not without its problems. For example, there is a conceptual problem in that some people will always be in each position, so that in a highly integrated sample there will nonetheless be some people classified as 'marginalized'. There is also an empirical problem -- dichotomizing scales inevitably leads to an unnecessary loss of information (indeed, the authors themselves describe low power as a limitation on page 17). My preference would be for researchers who have bidimensional measures to use them as such and study the relation between the two dimensions and whatever outcome measures they are interested in. If the authors prefer to use this four-strategy approach based on median splits, the choice should be fully justified.

3. Given the extensive literature on acculturation strategies and adjustment, did the authors have any specific hypotheses. At the moment, the study is presented
as an investigation of the relationship between the four strategies and mental health. If the authors chose to conduct an exploratory study without hypotheses, how did they protect against alpha inflation?

4. In order to better evaluate the bidimensional adaptation of the acculturation scale (for which it had not been originally designed), it would be helpful to see the 25 items and how they were assigned to the two dimensions. If this is not possible, the authors should report on the item numbers of the items on each dimension, and present a couple of examples from each dimension. Ideally, the division of the items into two dimensions would be established by some kind of factor analysis. What was the correlation between the two dimensions?

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

5. In the abstract and throughout, p-values cannot equal .00 (i.e., zero). The authors should either show the full number of zeroes, or should report as < .01.

6. The authors should review the manuscript carefully for typographical errors. For example, on page 5, 'assimilation is the second strategy' is entirely rendered in italics, rather than just 'assimilation'. On page 8, 'withe' should be 'with'. There may be others that I missed.

7. The authors note in the introduction that the relatively high rate of depression/anxiety among Turkish residents of the Netherlands might be due to their status as migrants. What explanation do they have for the much higher rates in Turkish versus Moroccan residents of the Netherlands? These findings suggest that something else is additionally contributing to the high Turkish rates. I appreciate that the paper is not meant to be a comparison of different ethnocultural communities, but a brief discussion of this point would be helpful in terms of better summarizing the particular stresses faced by the Turkish-Dutch community.

8. More information should be provided about the translation procedure. Who were the translators? How were disputes resolved? Any particular issues that were difficult to resolve that might impact how results are interpreted? If any formal translation protocols were used, these should be identified and cited.

9. Somewhere in the literature review and/or the discussion, the authors should at least address the issue of how depression and anxiety are presented in Turkish populations. There is a considerable literature on how culture shapes the presentation of psychopathology -- might such cultural variations have impacted the results? To what extent are the authors confident in the use of either their acculturation or diagnostic measures in Turkish samples?

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

10. Unless this journal has a different format than what I am used to in psychology, I recommend that Latin letters used as statistical symbols should be rendered in italics, whereas Greek letters should not.
11. The authors should consider simply removing the 16 second-generation participants. Doing so would improve sample homogeneity and remove a study limitation, without greatly decreasing the statistical power.
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