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Reviewer's report:

The authors have completed a useful study of the psychometric properties of the German version of the RFQ. Their data analytic methods are well chosen. For example, the use of half the sample for an exploratory factor analysis, reserving the other half for CFA based on its results, is excellent. Also, they provide sound arguments for eliminating item 3 from the RFQ and present concurrent validity correlations for the RFQ based on having deleted this item.

I had just a couple of minor suggestions about this paper. In particular:

1. From p. 6 I could not tell if participants under 18 were actually deleted from the sample. It is indicated that they were, but then also that the age range of participants included 16 on the low end.

2. I thought more might have been said about the specifics of what associations would be expected, conceptually, between RFQ dimensions and Big Five traits, and why.

3. The results pattern, with sizable correlations for the promotion subscale and not for the prevention subscale, is clear, but interpretation thereof perhaps less so. One pattern that is manifest in Table 3 [English versions of items] is that 4 of the 5 prevention items reference what the person was like as a child, whereas none of the promotion items do. I did not see anything in the description of the theory that requires this differential content for the two subscales, and it may be relevant to explaining the different pattern of correlations with other [presumably present-focused, not asking what the person was like growing up] personality tests.

4. The Discussion of limitations of the study should perhaps mention that all measures were self-report questionnaires. There is no information from this investigation as to whether RFQ scores relate to behavior, diagnosis, or anything else about the participant aside from additional voluntary self-descriptions of what they are generally like.
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