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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes the internal validation of a new scale, the Family Health Questionnaire (FHQ). This scale is comprised of 10 risk factors drawn from the literature, and is intended to be quick and easy to administer. Such a scale would clearly be useful to practitioners; however, I had a number of serious concerns about the statistical analyses that need to be addressed.

- The presentation of the exploratory factor analysis is missing many details and the interpretation may be incorrect. The authors report that 1- and 2-factor models differ significantly, but interpret this as favouring the 1-factor (simpler) model. However, a significant chi-square difference test generallyb indicates that the more complex model is preferred, as the improvement in fit to the data is "worth" the loss in parsimony. In reporting factor analysis results, it would be useful to provide a table with other fit indices if available (RMSEA, CFI, SRMR) to help evaluate model fit, for all models tested.

- More broadly, the analyses do not match the conceptualization of FHQ scale. The scale is initially described as a set of formative indicators, but reflective measurement models are tested. Reflective measurement assumes the indicators all stem from a common cause (here, latent risk). In formative measurement, indicators are conceptualized as contributing to a common latent composite. The latter seems more appropriate here.

- The Discussion largely reiterates points from the introduction, with relatively little space devoted to considering the findings and their implications.

- Page 8, lines 19-29 - the sample size doesn't seem to add up. If 315 participants were recruited, minus 2 parents who declined to participate and one parent with a language barrier, this should leave a sample size of 312, not 313 as reported.

- Page 9, lines 53 & 56 - references to Figures 2 and 3 should both reference Figure 1.

- There are numerous typos and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.
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