

In line 28, Rasch measurement model is not an instrument in the sense Stanford-Binet and MMPI are, nor is it Likert scale, for that matter. Distinguish between types of questions (items) and concrete measurement instruments (MMPI for example).

In line 32, it is not clear what is meant by „scientifically accepted (validated) manner“. Validation is not connected with item format, but with content of the item.

The paragraph from line 40 to line 44 is not easy to understand. The authors should reformulate the sentences in this paragraph using traditional scientific language.

In line 50, ipsative does not refer to a Likert scale without neutral point. Also, the absence of a neutral position is in no way specific only to asymmetrical Likert type scales.

In line 52, having more than the usual 5 levels of choice on a given item does not mean that „more continuums of choices are granted“. Rather, it's still the same continuum, only responses can be graded more finely.

In lines 55 – 63, the distinction between a Likert scale, and a Likert type scale is not clear. The authors don't even mention the content of the items which is in fact a crucial distinction here.

In lines 68 – 74, no argument is given for preference of a 7 point as compared to the 5 point Likert scale in terms of psychometric properties. Once again, reliability and validity of a scale depend little on the form of items and almost exclusively to their content.

In line 82, the sentence „The provision of number of scale points, 5 point or 7 point, would be more engaging to the minds of respondents when the items on the scale carry the statement of ideas near the truth of the universe for both the participants and the surveyor.“ is unclear.