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Title of the manuscript: Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire-44 (OBQ-44)

I would like to thank the journal and the authors the opportunity to review this paper.

The objective of this study is to provide evidence of the psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the Obsessive Beliefs Questionnaire-44 (OBQ-44). Specifically, it reports results related to its factorial structure, construct validity, internal consistency and test-retest reliability, in both clinical and non-clinical samples.

This is a relevant paper, which I have read with interest, given that the validation of the Chinese version of the OBQ-44 would contribute to a further understanding of the role of obsessive beliefs in OCD (and other disorders) in this population, and it will help with the study of the cross-cultural features of the disorder.

Mayor Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors followed the criteria recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999) to test the suitability of a three-factor structure in the Chinese version of the OBQ-44. According to the data presented in the study, and taking into account Hu and Bentler criteria, the goodness of fit indexes show that the model doesn’t fit the data properly (please, see some suggestions below). However, on the contrary to what was argued by the authors, with the results provided, we cannot conclude that the Chinese version of the OBQ-44 assesses the same constructs than the original version of the instrument or the validations of this measure into other languages/cultures.

2. Regarding to the convergent validity, the results in the clinical sample show that the correlation between all OBQ-44 scores (total and subscales) and BDI total score is higher than the correlation between all OBQ-44 scores and Y-BOCS total score. Given that the correlation of the OBQ-44 with a measure of general distress is higher than with a measure of OCD severity, we cannot discard that the OBQ-44 scale is merely assessing low mood. We would need more information to conclude that the Chinese version of the OBQ-44 shows good convergent validity. For example, it would be useful to have information about the correlations of the instrument with a different scale of OCD symptoms,
like the Padua Inventory (for example, Julien et al, 2008) or the Obsessive Compulsive Inventory (for example, Wu and Carter, 2008).

The cross-cultural validation of instruments is a major challenge as it provides a useful tool to study if we can extrapolate relevant constructs, identified in western populations, to non-western populations. I would like to make some suggestions that the authors can have into account if they think it is convenient. Specifically:

3. In my opinion, regarding to the confirmatory factor analysis, it would be important to report: a) the method used to estimate the model fit (for example, unweighted least squares method or maximum-likelihood estimation method), b) the kind of matrix used (for example, covariance matrix or correlation matrix). Given the ordinal nature of the Likert-type scale, used in the OBQ-44, I would dare recommend the authors to use the unweighted least squares method on the polychoric correlation matrix (for example, Yang-Wallentin, Jöreskog and Luo, 2010).

4. As the authors have chosen to follow Hu and Bentler (1999) guidelines, they should report the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residuals (SRMR), to evaluate the three-factor model fit.

5. As the model does not fit the data properly, I would recommend the authors to explore if there is one or more than one item that could be responsible of it. Specifically, figure 1 shows that at least two items (item 1 and item 44) show low lambda values. Taking this into account, the review of these items could help to improve the model fit. Besides this, given the high correlation between the three factors/subscales (please, see figure 1), it would be interesting to test a one-factor model.

6. Regarding the convergent/discriminant validity, I would encourage the authors to test if the correlations between OBQ-44 scores (total and subescales) and Y-BOCS total score were significantly different to the correlations between OBQ-44 scores and the measure of general distress (BDI). In addition, it could be helpful to calculate the correlations of OBQ-44 scores and Y-BOCS total score partialling out BDI scores (in both samples). If, after this, OBQ-44 scores and Y-BOCS scores are significantly correlated, this will help to provide evidence of the convergent validity of the instrument.

7. It would be interesting to know the means and the standard deviations of OBQ-44 scales, in clinical and non-clinical samples, and to test if there are significant differences between both. If there are significant differences, the authors will have additional evidence of the discriminative validity of the instrument.

8. With regards to the Participants section, the authors should explain why they think that patients over 50 or with other mental illness are not going to be able to understand the procedure.

9. In the Discussion section, it would be interesting to compare more in the detail the structure of the Chinese version of the OBQ-44 with the structure of other
Minor Essential Revisions

10. Please, report mean age and standard deviation in clinical sample.

11. Please, include Beaton et al. reference in the manuscript (Measures and Reference sections):


12. Please, include references of the English versions of the instruments.

13. It would be interesting to provide the numerical data of the psychometric properties of the Chinese versions of the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale and the Beck Depression Inventory.

14. Please, correct some typos that appear in the manuscript. Just a few examples: Lines 84, 144, 322, 217-218 (“Moreover, non-clinical samples had higher Cronbach’s alpha coefficients than the non-clinical sample in current study”).

15. Please, correct some references. Just a few examples: Lines 286 and 315 (“American Psychiatric Association” instead of “American Psychological Association”), Lines 312-314 (Journal name is missing), Line 325 (authors surname is missing).
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Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.