Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Development and Preliminary Psychometric Evaluation of the Height Dissatisfaction Scale"

Giulia Ferrazzi[1]

1. Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

Thank you for the opportunity to read and review this manuscript. I suggest Major Revision.

Bidirectionality is the main claim, but it is never tested. At a minimum, run separate analyses for participants who wish to be shorter (negative height discrepancy) to show the items work in that direction too. Items 7, 9, and 10 also appear oriented toward a single direction.

The alphas reported in the text do not match Table 3: NPSS-S .91 vs .88, EDEQ-S .91 vs .82, B-RSES .86 vs .81. Please clarify which values belong to the current sample.

The final sample is ambiguous: 443 "final" participants, yet 40 were excluded listwise, and the p-values for the height correlations (rs = .25, p = .003) imply an n well below 400. Report the effective n for each analysis and the proportion of missing data on actual and ideal height.

Comparing correlations with Steiger's z is not incremental validity. Either run a hierarchical regression with the NPSS-S entered at step 1, or rename the section (comparative concurrent validity).

The item retention criterion is inconsistent: item 7 (loading .41, uniqueness .83) is kept while items 6 and 8 are dropped on similar grounds. Report the loadings of the removed items, justify the decision, and renumber the final scale 1 to 12.

Typos and missing references: response scales described incorrectly (EDEQ-S "4 point scale from 0 to 4", NPSS-S "5 point scale from 0 to 5"), incomplete Table 3 note ("NPSS-S =;"), inconsistent acronyms (BRES, EDE-QS), and Boateng 2018, Gideon 2016, Monteiro 2021, and Rosenberg 1965 cited but absent from the reference list.

doi.org/10.32388/CHKOSL

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.