1---The paper is very long. I think it is better to do something about that now than wait for the reviewers' and the Editor's verdict. I have two suggestions: (a) Some of the material can perhaps be moved to an Appendix or Supplementary Files; and (b) Sentences and paragraphs may be shortened here and there. I noticed that you use very long sentences that boil down to simple messages like: Method A showed better results than Method B. Please, scan the paper to see what you can do. I indicated in several places where I expect you may be successful shortening text.  
  
2---First sentence on page 2: The problem with data in the social, behavioral and health sciences is that they are very messy, noisy, multidimensional, and lack strong signals. So, your message that we deal with high-quality data looks a little like a marketing trick. I wouldn't do that and say nothing about the issue, other than that, nowadays, datasets tend to contain many variables. The methods you are studying are suited for such datasets. That's enough.  
  
3---On page 3, Scope, you seem to imply that we should be happy that your methods do not require the researcher to choose variables for imputation, but I think this could also be framed as a curse rather than a merit. Please, explain why we are dealing with merit here and why it is no problem that we discourage researchers to think for themselves.  
  
4---Page 4, top: Here, it looked to me that the notation used is not unequivocally defined. Please, check.  
  
5---Sometimes, the jargon you use is very much directed to an in-crowd of only a few people. For example, on page 6, you talk about stems and leaves as if everybody should know that this is not botany but statistics. Can you find a way to increase transparency, here and elsewhere? After all, the paper seems to address a large audience of methodologists, statisticians, and researchers who are no experts in stems and leaves. We want many people to read and understand the paper.  
  
6---Jargon like "statistical validity" does not make clear exactly what you think. For example, when you mean that a method produces unbiased estimates, just say so. The same with ecological validity. I know this is a popular phrase, but it is also vague and does not make explicit what one means. I also read the term "integrity of hypothesis testing", where you mean "correctness of ...." I suggest to avoid such vague terminology and say precisely what you mean.  
  
7---In the Results section, you often write "condition 4", and so on, but it would help me tremendously if you would refer to conditions by using labels. For example, low-dimensionality condition 4.  
  
8---Often, one sentence is printed as a separate paragraph, but one sentence cannot be a single paragraph. I indicated that everywhere I saw it. Also, when you introduce an acronym, you have to use it consistently in the remainder of the text.  
  
9---To my dismay, over the past couple of years, people have begun using the word "fit" as a synonym for "estimate". So, they fit models when they mean that they estimate the models' parameters from the data. However, there is also the topic of goodness-of-fit of a model to the data from which it was estimated, and if the model does not fit, the parameter estimates may be useless. So, I would like you to write "estimate" when you estimate parameters.   
  
10---You show a tendency to use human characteristics when discussing models' results. For example, you write about the model's "behavior" as if it were a human being who might be held responsible for the bias and bad CIC it produces. I am joking a little, of course, but perhaps you can try to avoid this kind of language as much as possible. For example, I think you can often write things like "the model's results."   
  
11---In the Discussion section, I think it should be possible to use shorter sentences and clear-cut conclusions. You provide too many details and too many words. What the reader needs are clear conclusions that are easy to remember.