**Article Control Number**. The current manuscript, *article title in italics*, seeks to one sentence summary of the paper. The topic is indeed timely/lacks novelty and has/unfortunately lacks the potential to contribute both to theory and practice. I found the front end of the paper informative/repetitive/well-structured/straightforward and fairly easy/difficult to read. That said, concerns regarding the research design/potential contribution limit this potential.

I first highlight my main concerns and recommendations. The remainder of my comments and observations are offered largely in the order in which they occur in the manuscript. It is my intent that these items will be helpful in moving this research forward.

**Main Points**

1. On page XX, you state “XXXX.” However, this prediction does not line up with H1, H2a and H2b.
2. On pg XX, first paragraph under Results, you performed a moderation analysis, but did not offer a moderation hypothesis. I’m confused.

**Other Comments and Observations**

Methods

1. The alpha reliabilities for the variables of interest in this study are unusually high. I would confirm these just to be sure.
2. I recommend indicating the statistical package used to perform the regression analyses (e.g. SPSS, STATA, etc).
3. It is customary to offer a Table 1 with means, standard deviations and correlations among the variables of interest. I recommend that you include such.
4. It is also customary to display the results of your regression models in a Table.
5. I was surprised to not see any control variables reported. How do you rule out alternative explanations and endogeneity without some control variables?
6. How were these slopes/lines determined (e.g. +/- 1 sd above and below the mean)? Did you conduct a significance test to determine if the slopes of the lines were significantly different from zero? Was this based on the work of Aiken and West (1991)? If so, it would be good to ground your work in theirs as well as others who have.
7. What type of procedure did you use to test for mediation? Was this Baron and Kenny (1986)? If so, I would briefly review their guidance for how to test for mediation.

Implications

1. Point
2. Point
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