

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:

The manuscript is interesting and well-written. I want to suggest some minor comments that may help to improve the methodological soundness of the study.

METHOD

1. The manuscript would benefit from a sample size calculation to confirm that you have a sufficient number of participants. I suggest using an IFC calculator (https://wnarifin.shinyapps.io/ss_sem_cfi_unequal/). For example, for the long version with 8 items and 4 items, with an estimated average factor loading of 0.6, a latent correlation of 0.6, a significance level of 0.05 and a power of 80%, a sample size of at least 255 participants is estimated. I suggest adding a similar sample size calculation for the short and long versions.

2. I would suggest adding a section on the setting that allows us to understand the context in which these Peruvian adults live. Perhaps for those of us who do not live in Peru, it would help us to understand better the contextual characteristics in which the study is being conducted.

3. Please point out that the "Dirección de Investigación de la Escuela de Psicología de la Universidad Autónoma del Perú" is a research ethics committee. Submission of the study to an ethics committee is a mandatory criterion for publication.

4. I would suggest adding an analysis of measurement invariance in both the methods and results sections.

RESULTS

5. I would suggest adding a section on participant characteristics so that the prevalence of participants' depressive and anxiety symptoms can be noted. It would also be recommended that the sensitivity and specificity values of the PHQ-2 and GAD-2 in the Peruvian context for estimating the presence of depressive and anxious symptoms, respectively, be reported (in the methods). This would allow a better understanding of the participants.

6. I would suggest adding the instrument's items to make it easier to use this scale (only if the instrument is free and open access).

DISCUSSION

7. I would suggest adding subsections to this section. One on main findings; comparison with other studies; public health implications; strengths and limitations; and conclusions.

RESPONSE LETTER

Dear reviewer and editor,

OBSERVATIONS	Responses to observations
<p>METHOD</p> <p>1. The manuscript would benefit from a sample size calculation to confirm that you have a sufficient number of participants. I suggest using an IFC calculator (https://wnarifin.shinyapps.io/ss_sem_cfi_unequal/). For example, for the long version with 8 items and 4 items, with an estimated average factor loading of 0.6, a latent correlation of 0.6, a significance level of 0.05 and a power of 80%, a sample size of at least 255 participants is estimated.</p> <p>I suggest adding a similar sample size calculation for the short and long versions.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your comment. The sample sizes for both the long and short versions have been added based on the results obtained.</p>
<p>2. I would suggest adding a section on the setting that allows us to understand the context in which these Peruvian adults live. Perhaps for those of us who do not live in Peru, it would help us to understand better the contextual characteristics in which the study is being conducted.</p>	<p>We appreciate the feedback. We have added a section both in the introduction and the participants' section.</p>
<p>3. Please point out that the "Dirección de Investigación de la Escuela de Psicología de la Universidad Autónoma del Perú" is a research ethics committee. Submission of the study to an ethics committee is a mandatory criterion for publication</p>	<p>It has been noted that it is a research and ethics committee in the corresponding section.</p>
<p>4. I would suggest adding an analysis of measurement invariance in both the methods and results sections</p>	<p>An attempt was made to carry out measurement invariance analysis. However, this could not be done, which is justified in discussing the results.</p>
<p>RESULTS</p> <p>5. I would suggest adding a section on participant characteristics so that the prevalence of participants' depressive and anxiety symptoms can be noted. It would also be recommended that the sensitivity and specificity values of the PHQ-2 and GAD-2 in the Peruvian context for estimating the presence of depressive and anxious symptoms, respectively, be reported (in the methods). This would allow a better understanding of the participants.</p>	<p>The prevalence of depressive and anxiety symptoms has been added to the participants' section.</p> <p>In addition, information on the sensitivity and specificity values closest to those related to the Peruvian context has been added.</p>
<p>6. I would suggest adding the instrument's items to make it easier to use this scale (only if the instrument is free and open access).</p>	<p>Regarding permissions, it has been stipulated that distribution must be controlled, so publishing the test freely in its entirety in the manuscript would not be feasible. This may be required if it is to be used for research purposes. This aspect has been placed at the end of the document in the Material availability section.</p>

Okumura-Clark, A., Blancas-Guillen, J., Ccoyllo-Gonzalez, L., & Valencia, P. D. (2024). Psychometric properties comparison among diverse versions of the invalidation childhood environmental scale (ICES) in Peruvian adults. *Interacciones*, 10, e424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2024.v10.424>

DISCUSSION

7. I would suggest adding subsections to this section. One on main findings; comparison with other studies; public health implications; strengths and limitations; and conclusions.

Subtitles have been added based on reviewer recommendations.