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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript "Internal Structure and Reliability of the Attachment Insecurity Screening Inventory (AISI) for Children Age 6 to 12" is an up to date and interesting paper within the field of psychological assessment. The current research examines Internal Structure and Reliability of the scores of the AISI for Children Age 6 to 12. The data and analysis is valuable and very interesting, and adds substantially to existing literature. In general, the paper is very interesting; it contains new scientific knowledge and provides comprehensive information for further development of this productive line of research. However, I have a few comments to make that should be addressed before I recommend this manuscript for publication to BMC psychiatry:

1.- Add all the main hypothesis of the present study at the end of introduction.

2.- Add more information about the all sociodemographic characteristics of the samples used, e.g., ethnicity, socio-economic status, specific diagnostic and comorbidities, previous treatment, etc.). Please, add a new table with the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample used.

3.- Are they receive some reward or gratification? These issues are quite relevant. Please explain.

4.- Please talk about sources of validity evidence and not about "validity". Sources of validity are well-known classification by AERA, NCME, and APA (2014). Moreover, it would be "reliability of the scores", not reliability. For instance, Please add a new name of the subsection in the Results about "reliably of the scores" and "sources of validity evidence in relation with other variables" or "sources of validity evidence of internal structure".

5.- Please, add information about the ethics committee issues.

6.- Please, study other factorial models as Bifactor model.

7.- There is a Likert scale, so I think that you could use polychoric correlations to compute and estimate the factor loadings in CFA as well as reliability of the scores.

8.- There is no p=0,000 It would be p>0.001.
9.- Add information in the results section about the reliability of the scores. In fact add information about ordinal alpha (Zumbo et al., 2007) or Omega to solve some problems of Cronbach. Please, See Dunn et al, 2014, From alpha to omega, British Journal of Psychology.

10.- Add the references for all statistical software used.

11. I think that here multilevel CFA has the same meaning that measurement invariance analysis (See Byrne, Mplus book).

12.- Add information about how you are dealing with missing values.

13.- Add information about 90% confidence interval of RMSEA.

14.- They have used a measures based on self-report information is a clear limitations. These facts could affect the validity of the findings what you found. Please, add in the limitation section of the manuscript.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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