

Editor's Comment:

Rejected the paper for publication for these reasons:

I have just finished reading the manuscript entitled, "Compilation of Humor Scale for Applied Undergraduates in Fuzhou," and I regret to say that it suffers from a number of severe limitations that hampered its scientific usefulness. I will try to detail the major limitations of the study.

1. The English language is definitively poor, starting from the title (i.e., what does the expression "applied undergraduates" mean?) and the abstract (e.g., "collected by reverent literature review": reverent means respectful; thus, I suspect that the authors meant to say "relevant" rather than reverent). Moreover, some sentences reported in the text lacks a bibliographic reference: e.g. "According to the social theory of humor, individuals with a sense of humor perform much better in communication and social adaptation than those without a sense of humor" or "The former sense of humor scale has some defects in measuring the sense of humor of applied undergraduates under the new situation". In sum, the manuscript would benefit from copy editing for general grammatical errors and typos.

2. From a psychometric perspective, scale creation and development require: (a) writing and/or selecting a broad range of items that should be administered to a large representative sample of participants; (b) items revision and elimination with the goal of clarifying the emerging constructs by enhancing both the internal consistency of the sub-scales and their independence from each other, and (c) based on these results, writing additional items either to solidify and refine the constructs assessed by the subscales or to expand them. This process needs to be repeated through additional rounds of data collection, scale revision, and cross-validation using independent samples (e.g., Clark & Watson, 1995; 2019). I regret to say that the authors failed to consider this framework in developing the SOH.

Moreover, the sample size of this study is too small for the objectives proposed by the authors.

3. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) represent appropriate techniques to evaluate the factor structure of a scale, but they should not be used to assess the dimensionality of a measure. CFA may be used to determine whether the items selected to represent each dimension tapped a single dimension (as intended), or instead measured more than one trait – i.e., unidimensionality assumption check. However, if the authors were interested in assessing the dimensionality of the SOH items, they should have relied on dimensionality analysis (before computing factor analysis) relying on quasi-inferential parallel analysis – because it has been shown to be the one of the most efficient method for recovering the correct number of factors in Monte Carlo studies; Zwick & Velicer, 1986. Notably, freeware, user-friendly programs are available. For instance, FACTOR (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2006) has been designed as a general program for computing exploratory factor analysis; it implements traditional procedures and indices and incorporates parallel analysis.

4. I suggest the authors to rely on polychoric correlation coefficients in order to compute the correlation matrix of the SOH items (e.g., for factor analysis) because the SOH items are measured on a Likert scale (i.e., to take into account the ordinal nature of the items). Polychoric correlation matrix, indeed, assumes that there is an underlying normal distribution to discrete responses (e.g., Holgado-Tello et al., 2010).

5. I regret to say that some of the authors conclusions are definitively wrong or poorly justified. For instance, the sentences "The value coefficients of the five dimensions of the questionnaire are all above 0.60, reaching an acceptable level. It indicates that there is a high internal consistency among the questions in each level of the questionnaire and the reliability index is good. A good questionnaire structure requires a correlation coefficient between dimensions between 0.1 and 0.6." are misleading and incorrect. Indeed, it is true that satisfactory level of reliability depends on how a measure is being used. However, it is important to note that a reliability of .70 is the bare minimum, and a reliability of .90 should be considered the desirable standard (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

6. The statistic's tables in this paper are missing relevant data necessary in order to consider the article a scientific paper, for example the significance value are missing.

7. The conclusions set out are conceptually poor. The concepts proposed in the conclusions do not follow a logical connection with what is stated in the results: it would be necessary to introduce the

results obtained in a discussion section before introducing them in a speculative way. In addition, the last part of the study are missing the limits of the study (e.g. reduced number ...) and future perspectives.

Bibliography

- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological assessment*, 7(3), 309-319.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (2019). Constructing validity: New developments in creating objective measuring instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 31(12):1412-1427.
- Holgado-Tello, F. P., Chacón-Moscoso, S., Barbero-García, I., & Vila-Abad, E. (2010). Polychoric versus Pearson correlations in exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of ordinal variables. *Quality & Quantity*, 44(1), 153.
- Lorenzo-Seva, U., & Ferrando, P. J. (2006). FACTOR: A computer program to fit the exploratory factor analysis model. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38(1), 88-91.
- Nunnally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.R. (1994) *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Zwick, W. R., & Velicer, W. F. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99(3), 432-442.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Sara Marelli
Department of Neuroscience, Scientific Institute and University Hospital IRCCS San Raffaele Ville Turro, Italy.