**Thank you for the opportunity to review this registration. I have found the authors’ research outline to be both well-written and well-argued throughout. Below, you can find more specific comments pertaining to Stage 1 review.**

**1A. The scientific validity of the research question(s).** The questions the authors wish to address are scientifically valid, since they aim to address the relatively well-known problem of whether short-scales can adequately capture a phenomenon of interest (that is usually measured with larger-scales).

**1B. The logic, rationale, and plausibility of the proposed hypotheses, as applicable. The authors do not appear to have explicit hypotheses but instead outline a number of different research questions, each associated with specific (development) phases of their project. Although I have found those research questions applicable in terms of addressing the authors’ aims (and I particularly enjoyed the authors’ use of network psychometrics), I think the pre-registration will benefit by outlining clearly these research questions at the start of each section (i.e., outline the research questions of Development Phase 1, 2, and 3 in a numbered way).**

**1C. The soundness and feasibility of the methodology and analysis pipeline (including statistical power analysis or alternative sampling plans where applicable). The statistical analyses are comprehensively outlined, have direct correspondence with the research questions, and appear sound and realistic.**

**1D. Whether the clarity and degree of methodological detail is sufficient to closely replicate the proposed study procedures and analysis pipeline and to prevent undisclosed flexibility in the procedures and analyses. As briefly alluded earlier, I have found the authors’ outline of statistical analyses to be very comprehensive and detailed. At the same time, however, I believe that the registration will be strengthened with the inclusion of detailed and numbered research questions (and a brief parenthetical note of the statistical analyses, aimed at addressing them).**

**1E. Whether the authors have considered sufficient outcome-neutral conditions (e.g. absence of floor or ceiling effects; positive controls; other quality checks) for ensuring that the obtained results are able to test the stated hypotheses or answer the stated research question(s). The authors have proposed a number of simulation, sensitivity, and power analyses to ensure that their data can address the authors’ research questions.**