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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript describes a revised version of the Depression Attitude Questionnaire (DAQ). Despite its wide diffusion, the DAQ presents some problems, as vague factorial structure, that authors try to fix. This question is well defined and well described in the introduction.

Basically, the study is aimed to develop the revised form of the DAQ. The research methodology is divided in two steps: the development phase, based on the Delphi method, and the testing phase, aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the R-DAQ as adjusted during the development phase. In my opinion, the authors performed a meticulous job and the methods are suitable: it's uncommon to find a similar work, really well done and accurate. However, since my background is in the field of psychometrics, I cannot evaluate in deep the precision of the application of the Delphi methodology.

I report some minor essential revisions and discretionary revisions.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1) ABSTRACT. At the line 41, the authors indicate a sample of n = 1044, but in the manuscript their declare an overall sample of n = 1193 (from this sample, 146 subject are not considered in the analyses). The authors must correct the abstract.

2) BACKGROUND. The authors present the DAQ, but they not declare which is the number of item of the original instrument. Since the number of items is an aspect debated during the manuscript, I think this information could be useful.

RESULTS (testing phase).

3) The authors implement an item selection procedure, reducing the number of items from 30 to 22. This is described at lines 342-349. However, the criteria applied to select the items are not explicated. A closer examination about this point can be useful to better understand the method.

4) At line 353, the authors declare that two items presents low item-total correlation with the overall scale but they retained these items. It’s unclear which are these items. The authors can consider to report in tables the item-total correlation values.

5) TABLES. The number of subjects should be indicated in captions.
REFERENCES. There are some references in which the journal name is written not in short form but in extended form. Below, I reported the correct short name (to check):

[10,14] British Journal of General Practice -> Brit J Gen Pract
[18] Aging & Mental Health -> Aging Ment Health
[26] This reference seem to be incomplete (please verify).
[38] Multivariate Behavioral Research -> Multivar Behav Res
[42] Psychological Methods -> Psychol Methods
[46] Psychiatry -> Psychiatr

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

METHOD (testing phase).

(1) To identify the better factorial solutions, the authors used the Kaiser’s criterion and the elbow method (scree plot). There is a more powerful and accurate method to identify the dimensionality of a test: the parallel analysis, also cited in the reference [31]. To give more strength to results, the authors may perform a parallel analysis, which provides a simple criterion to establish the dimensionality.

(2) Further, since the Kaiser criterion is used, in the scree plot in figure 1 can be useful to report a straight horizontal line corresponding to eigen = 1. This line can assist the reader to identify which components present an eigenvalue greater than one.

(3) At line 383, the authors describe the distribution of the three factors. These distributions should be shown in a figure.
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