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Reviewer's report:

GENERAL EVALUATION

This study gives a clear and satisfactory rationale for probing the construct validity of the PACIC. Nevertheless the results given can not sufficiently give information about the factorial structure of the German version in the over-weighted PHC patients. The authors may need to run some further (detailed) psychometric analyses including CFA.

Introduction:

The background literature information on the PACIC is well reflected in the introduction section and also the need for conducting this study is supported with satisfactory literature evidence.

Methods and Results:

This study may be classified as a methodological (cross-cultural validity) study on the baseline - opportunistic sample- data of an intervention trial, rather than being as a cross-sectional design. There is no clue about how the 160 patients (further decreased to 117) were recruited from the 39 general practices in Central Germany.

Reliability analyses are limited to Alpha values for each of the pre-reported subscales and found satisfactory internal consistency figures.

Although floor and ceiling effects are given in the study (as a measurement competency of the instrument) no item item analyses were done. For example item-total correlation analyses and also "if item deleted Cronbach alpha" values are lacking.

PACIC was originally developed with a 5 factor model. So since the authors aim to explore the factorial structure of the PACIC 5A- they are expected to give both EFA results explicitly with a separate table and also run a confirmatory factor analyses (They did not run CFA, although they discussed CFA results of different studies in the discussion section). They reported that they
identified 4 factor structure by EFA in the results section. Reader needs to see the results of this this EFA and also Scree Plot.

As for their claim of one factor solution, we need to see the loadings for the other possible factors. On the other hand, the first factor only explains 43%-44% of the variances and this percentages may not be sufficient for the one factor solutions.

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?
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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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