The authors did a commendable job in developing and validating the Knowledge anxiety scale with robust psychometric properties. The following are observations from the work.

It would be best if previous studies quoted in line 42 contains more than one study to justify that claim. Line 47-52 in the introduction is best expunged or best placed in conclusion as it is already presenting a conclusion where an introduction should have been.

Line 62 to 119 contains redundant and repetitive discuss. This should be streamlined to be more concise. Most importantly, the introduction ought to clearly introduce the key concept under discussion and this appears to be deficit. Some of the ideas presented in the beginning part of Development of the initial items under materials and methods, would have been more aped if they were introduced in the introductory section. Information on the objectives and research questions which are to guide the work is missing from the introduction

The ideas presented in the development of initial item in 2.1 gives a clear direction as to the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of the key variable under study, however, they were not reported in a style that makes it easy to understand. It is best if these key variables are explained in more details. Also, proper citations need to done to back up the claims especially lines 124 to line129. Author cited in line 130 needs to be properly cited.

The three-dimensional structural model of researchers' knowledge anxiety gives a strong conceptual backing to the instrument constructed. To further strengthen this, related literature that abounds on these areas can be cited. Introduction of subheadings in 2.1 can help with the flow of information and categorization of related themes for easy comprehension. This can be done by breaking 2.1 into stages or steps to clearly show what was done at each stage of the development of the initial items. Same can be done for 2.2. Citations needs to be properly done for line 179.

The report on the pilot study and results reveals a detailed and robust analysis required for test development and validation. It is commendable that the authors were able to give brief explanations for what each psychometric property means before giving detail and results obtained. For the dimensions of the instrument, there needs to be consistency or reconciliation or clearer details of the knowledge anxiety structural dimensions outlined in section 2.1 of cognitive, emotional and behavioral with the 4 dimensions mentioned in 2.2 in item consolidation and refinement and the 4-factor structure and naming in 3.2.3. For more clarity, more details need to be supplied as to how were the four factors structure of Knowledge anxiety obtained from multiple rounds of factor analysis and item consolidation falls or relates with the three dimensions outlined in 2.2. For instance, where does items under capability structure falls within the conceptualized three structural dimension.

The statistical detail on the items that were deleted at each section and the rational is commendable. However, for greater clarity, it would be great if there is a tabular presentation that shows this. For instance, a tabular presentation that would carry each factor structure, the initial items under each factor structure and the items that were deleted at each structure/factor.

A robust discussion was done on reliability, model fit and validity analysis. However, these discussions should be substantiated with citations. For instance, what was done in line 440 was great is a great example. A section or paragraph that contains scoring and interpretation of the knowledge anxiety instrument is ought to be included.

Thanks