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Reviewer's report:

A review of the methods of Unravelling the Complex Nature of Resilience Factors and their Changes between Early and Later Adolescence

Given that this topic area is outside my expertise, I was asked to review only the methods portion of this manuscript. Overall I think the methods are novel, but sound, and there is strong rationale for each step of the procedure. I haven't seen factor scores used in networks before, though it seems like a reasonable step in this procedure. It might help to discuss a bit of rationale for the usage of factor scores vs items and how the authors arrived at this decision. Additionally, I have to commend the authors for providing their code, data, and for using a pre-registered study. I have some other minor suggestions for methodological procedures that were unclear.

Methods: The authors mention missing data/attrition but do not discuss if it was missing at random, nor how missing data was handled. It is unclear to me if all data was used or just those with full data that was not lost to attrition. If the authors only used full data are their differences between participants lost to attrition versus those who were not? I would suggest imputing this data and using the full data if this was not already done. If the authors do not use this method, they should justify why.

It would be helpful throughout for the authors to add ns for each of their analyses in the methods section. For example, when discussing usage of the NCT, how many individuals were in each model? It's difficult to evaluate if the NCT might be biased without knowing the sample size.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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