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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

Many thanks for inviting me to review this paper. The manuscript is clearly-written, the methodology seems to be well-conducted. Specifically, the scales used to assess criterion validity were psychometrically sound and the statistical analyses appear adequate. I highlight some minor points which the authors should address before the manuscript can be considered suitable for publication.

-The objectives should be reported at the end of the Introduction section instead if being stated at the beginning of the Method section. In addition, the authors should provide a more detailed description of the objectives including the specific psychometric properties which were tested in the study
-Please, provide the guidelines and the related references used to interpret the values of internal consistency and correlation
-I suggest the authors to calculate the significance tests aimed to compare the level of strength in the association between the scores of the questionnaires. This can help them to support further their conclusions regarding criterion validity. Please, consider the significance tests reported in Meng et al. (1992). Meng, X. L., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients. Psychological bulletin, 111(1), 172-175.
-The authors considered modification indices as a strategy to improve the model fit. However, they did not provide explanations based on the items' content in order to justify why adding covariances between the residuals of some items. Please, discuss these points in the Discussion section

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.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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