LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:
Title and Abstract
1. Could you revise the abstract to make sure that all keywords use MeSH terms?
2. I recommend keeping the title: "Psychometric Properties of the Sexual Machismo Scale (EMS-SEXISMO-12) in Adults."

Introduction
3. I suggest minimizing the focus on the information about the city of Piura, as this makes the study overly local. Instead, focus on how this study compares with the international literature and addresses gaps in knowledge.
4. Including the research question at the end of the objective seems unusual for a scientific article. I think you should leave only the objective.

Method
5. I would suggest including a sample size calculation to ensure the number of participants is adequate. You may use this tool: https://wnarifin.shinyapps.io/ss_sem_cfi_unequal/.
6. Replace the subtitle "Tools" with "Instruments."
7. The Participants subsection should detail the inclusion/exclusion criteria and sampling process (e.g., non-probabilistic quota sampling).
8. Incorporate references to prior use of the EMS in similar populations.

Results
9. In Table 1, the meaning of "IA" is unclear. Please add a note to clarify.
10. Tables and figures should be referenced within the text. For example, each table or figure should be introduced in the preceding paragraph. Present Table 1 first, followed by the corresponding text. This should be consistent throughout the section.
11. Table 2 and Figure 1 display contradictory factor loadings. This suggests the model may rely on correlated error terms, which establish challenging assumptions. I strongly recommend using a simpler, more parsimonious, and replicable model.
12. Table 3 is unnecessary since its content is already presented in the text. I think you should remove it.
13. At a minimum, a measurement invariance analysis should be included. The study has significant limitations as it does not present evidence of external validity, such as relationships with other variables. It does not demonstrate clinical utility since no sensitivity and specificity analyses support cutoff points.
14. Avoid redundancies between the text and tables.

Discussion
15. I recommend comparing the results with other studies that used the EMS or related scales.
16. Include a limitations and strengths section for the study.
17. Add a section in the discussion to address the practical implications of using the EMS in clinical and social contexts.

Style
18. I suggest revising the English language used in the manuscript, as some sections could be more manageable to read.

Gonzales Ortiz, E. (2024). Psychometric properties of the sexual machismo scale (EMS-SEXISMO-12) in adults. *Interacciones, 10*, e439. http://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2024.v10.439

RESPONSE LETTER

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to you with the purpose of responding to the observations made in my article PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF THE SEXUAL MACHISMO SCALE (EMS-SEXISM-12) IN ADULTS.

First of all, I appreciate the observations you made, which have allowed me to identify areas for improvement and proceed with the appropriate corrections. I will detail the actions taken in order to response your observations:

O1: Title and summary

- MeSH terms were modified Paragraph 1, page 1-2
- The article is titled “Psychometric properties of the Sexual Machismo Scale (EMS-SEXISM-12) in Adults”. Paragraph 1, page 1

O2: Introduction

- Minimize the focus on information about the city of Piura by eliminating statistical data that emphasizes the locality. Paragraph 1, page 4
- I think the objective should be left alone. Paragraph 1, page 5

O3: Method

- This paper includes the sample size according to general APA standards Paragraph 3, p. 5
- It is replaced the subheading "Tools" with "Instruments" - Paragraph 4, page 5
- It is detailed inclusion/exclusion and sampling criteria - Paragraph 3, page 5
- It is incorporated references to previous use of EMS in similar populations. Paragraph 8 and 9 page 4.

O4: Results

- In Table 1, the meaning of “AI” is detailed in a note for clarification. Table 1, page 8.
- Tables and figures must be referenced within the text.
- In Table 2 and Figure 1, the image was rotated to avoid confusion. Therefore, their factor loadings coincide. Figure 1, page 9
- Table 3 was eliminated because is considered not necessary.
- It was decided not to perform measurement invariance analysis given the limitations of homogeneity of the groups and the number of participants.
- Redundancies between the text and tables were avoided, so I would appreciate it if you could specify the type of redundancies to raise them.

O5: Discussion

- The results were compared with other studies that used the EMS or related scales. The results are contrasted with theoretical definitions and background of studies that used and analyzed the Sexual Machismo Scale in various international contexts. Page 10 - 11
- A section on limitations and strengths of the study was included. Paragraph 2 page 12
- A section was added to the discussion to address the practical implications of using EMS in clinical and social contexts. Paragraph 3 page 12

O6: Style

- The English language used in the paper has been revised to make it easy to read.

These actions have been implemented in order to comply with the established standards and requirements. We thank you again for your follow-up and understanding in this process, and I remain at your disposal for additional questions.

I appreciate your attention and I look forward to your confirmation regarding the acceptance of the corrections made.

Yours sincerely,

Esther Gonzales Ortiz
Email:egonzalesortiz96@gmail.com