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Reviewer’s report:

The paper addresses an important research question. It would be strengthened by some revisions to the presentation and additions to the content. Key aspects are detailed below.

1. Overall the paper is written for an audience that is specialised in both psychology and sophisticated psychometric and statistical techniques. I would suggest

(a) making sure that all terms used with a specific, technical meaning are clearly defined, either in the main text or in supplementary material and (b) editing the text more generally so that it is accessible to non specialists. This would help a broader audience understand the methods and results and to assess the robustness and relevance of them for their own setting.

Some re-ordering of the material in the Literature review/introduction sections would help with this. For example resilience, hope and incremental validity are not defined in the introduction, but are defined in subsequent sections. How are cognitive, motivational, affective, social and transcendental attributes defined, both generally and in the context of this specific research?

2. There seems to be some overlap and duplication between the literature review, results and discussion sections. Careful editing could help reduce this and give extra words for more detail in the methods and limitations sections of the paper. In addition there is some overlap in the descriptions of the RSA and HHS descriptions given in the literature and methods sections, that could be reduced without loss of information.

3. More detail about the methods used would help the reader assess the robustness of the analyses, results and conclusions. In particular, more detail is needed about:

(a)How participants were identified, invited and selected to take part in the study, the sampling frame and target population. I wonder whether the detail given about the sample in the methods section would be better presented as results. Or is this a description of the population the participants were sampled from?

(b) What methods were used to identify relevant measures for the study and what criteria were used to select the measures used?
(c) More detail about the statistical analysis would be useful for the non-specialist, particularly when you are using advanced techniques.

* What does SEM stand for and more generally what are the aims of hierarchical and SEM regression models? How do they work? You discuss different steps - many readers will not be familiar with these types of models and it would be useful to guide them through.

* What is homoscedasticity and why is it important to account for it?

* What is the Hedges g and again why is it important.

(d) A diagram of the theoretical logic model underlying the research and statistical analysis might help in guiding the reader through the methods and results (including those presented in Figure 1).

4. A flow chart identifying the number of participants who were identified and invited to take part as well as those who consented to participate and those who completed the measures would be useful.

5. Some indication of how representative the participants are of the group sampled and the target population would be helpful - in the limitations sections you suggest the participants are representative - some data to demonstrate this is case is needed.

6. The limitations section could be strengthened by a discussion of the limitations of the response rate to the survey, self selection or researcher selection biases, whether there was any missing data (eg incomplete responses) and how this was handled, the statistical models used and how the robustness of them was assessed, the impact of unobserved variables on the analysis and results. More detail about each of these would help support the case you make for further research.
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