

The manuscript entitled "Constructing three emotion knowledge tests from the invariant measurement approach" is a fine study presented by the authors. Its main objective is the construction and validation of three tests to assess emotional understanding in vocabulary, and both concrete and abstract situations in native Spanish speakers. The instruments developed have shown psychometric properties allowing them to be used in the Spanish speakers population. Next, I made some suggestions I hope may improve the manuscript.

GRAMMAR SUGGESTIONS

Once I am not a native English speaker, I would suggest that authors review some of the passages below, because I felt they might need a grammar revision.

- Page 3, line 24-25 needs grammar revision
- Page 3, line 27 "These" refers to two or more things previously mentioned, but I couldn't understand what "these" were referring to.
- Page 13, line 262 "here" to "on our study"
- Page 4, line 50 "insert a comma after "Currently";

LANGUAGE SUGGESTIONS

- Page 3, line 32 "Correlate" due to its statistical meaning may not be used to refer to the relationship between experience and neural networks;
- Page 7, line 125 "testee" should be replaced by "subject"
- Page 9, line 173 "replace "favoring males" for "higher for males subjects" if the authors meant it. "Favor" is not clear.
- Page 13, line 258 "female participants were consistently better than male ones". "Better" should be replaced by "scored higher" or "responded correctly more often than"
- Page 13, line 259 "what the authors meant by saying "a robust (result)"? There were no significant differences between females and males. Without significant differences, effect size may show valence, which group scored higher/lower than the other, as the authors state; but they do not indicate strength of results.
- On result section, authors should clarify the meaning of "extreme scores", the reader cannot guess if extreme mean higher or lower than the average.

TEXT SUGGESTIONS

- Page 3, line 38 ó it is very similar (basic psychological ingredients that are more clearly respected by the brain) to the original work (a set of more basic, psychologically primitive ingredients that are more clearly respected by the brain ó by Barret, 2009). I strong encourage changing on this sentence to avoid accusation of a minor plagiarism.
- Page 4, line 47 and 48 ó phrases are too short. The relationship between sentences are not well stablished due to short sentences.
- Page 4, line 51 ó it is not clear what is a group factor.
- Page 4 ó line 56-57 ó Phrase is incomprehensible. Which criteria? For what?

CONTENT SUGGESTIONS

- Page 13, line 269 ó If the structure of instruments were similar for all of emotions, why happiness is easier to match than other? What is the explanation? Does it say anything about cognition and emotional knowledge? I think it would be important to discuss this result if the instruments are meant to evaluate perception/cognition.
- Considering that other studies have shown sex differences on accuracy of affective judgments, what is the explanation of the absence of sex related differences on this study? Is this a product of the instruments or a product of characteristics of the sample?
- I think, despite all the psychometric validity of the instruments developed by the authors, it is not clear the purpose of the development of the instruments, besides the theoretical reasons. What situations, populations they can be used for, e. g education, identification of any kind of disorder, alexithymia etc. I wonder, the readers would more interested on the manuscript if the authors state the instruments applicability in the real world.