LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors
Title
1. The title is clear; however, it is recommended to remove "from Puno, Peru" as this information is already included in the abstract.
2. The abstract should be structured according to the journal's required sections: background, objective, method, results, and conclusion.

Introduction
3. The introduction provides a broad context on alcoholism and its consequences. However, some paragraphs are overly extensive, and the argumentation could benefit from greater conciseness and structuring.
4. While the authors include relevant citations, some statistical data and study findings are referenced without proper citation. Please ensure that all claims are supported by appropriate bibliographic references.

Methods
5. The participants section mentions a non-probabilistic sampling method but does not justify why this approach was chosen or whether the representativeness of the sample was assessed.
6. In the instruments section, it is stated that the SRCAA scale consists of 19 items and two factors, but the criteria for item elimination in the exploratory factor analysis are not clearly explained.
7. It is recommended to include a measurement invariance analysis, as no evidence of external validity (relationship with other variables) is presented.

Results
8. In the convergent validity section, the GAD-7 scale is mentioned, but it is not included in the instruments section. This should be addressed. Additionally, the methods section should specify how convergent validity was assessed.
9. Table 6 repeats information already presented in the text; its inclusion may not be necessary.
10. Table 5 could be incorporated into the text. Consider whether a separate table is warranted for these values.
11. It is unclear how the decision to eliminate item C11 was made. Please clarify the criteria for item elimination in the methods section and further explain this decision in the results section.
12. The goodness-of-fit indices for the model with all items and the model without item C11 are very similar. The rationale for its removal is not sufficiently clear. Please provide a stronger justification.

Discussion
13. The discussion is relevant but lacks a more extensive comparison with previous studies that have developed similar scales in Latin American contexts.
14. The study's limitations section should acknowledge that measurement invariance was not assessed. It is strongly recommended to include this analysis, as it would strengthen the manuscript.
15. Consider expanding the discussion with explicit comparisons between the SRCAA and other validated scales in Latin American populations.

References
16. The references should follow APA 7 format, as required by the journal. Not all references include a DOI or complete information. Additionally, some in-text citations lack corresponding references at the end of the manuscript. Ensure that all in-text citations have a corresponding reference in the reference list.

RESPONSE LETTER

"We would like to thank you for the comments and suggestions provided. The authors have addressed them, and the corresponding modifications are detailed below."

Title

1. The title is clear; however, it is recommended to remove "from Puno, Peru" as this information is already included in the abstract.

In accordance with the recommendations, the title has been modified by removing "Puno, Peru" and replacing it with "peruvian adults with alcoholism."

2. The abstract should be structured according to the journal's required sections: background, objective, method, results, and conclusion.

We appreciate the suggestion, and the appropriate sections have been added to each part of the abstract.

Introduction

3. The introduction provides a broad context on alcoholism and its consequences. However, some paragraphs are overly extensive, and the argumentation could benefit from greater conciseness and structuring.

Irrelevant information has been reduced, and some sentences have been restructured to make them more concise.

4. While the authors include relevant citations, some statistical data and study findings are referenced without proper citation. Please ensure that all claims are supported by appropriate bibliographic references.

Each citation and its corresponding reference have been identified and corrected according to APA 7th edition formatting.

Methods

5. The participants section mentions a non-probabilistic sampling method but does not justify why this approach was chosen or whether the representativeness of the sample was assessed.

We are grateful for this observation. The type of sampling has now been specified, along with the inclusion criteria and a description of the sample's representativeness.

6. In the instruments section, it is stated that the SRCAA scale consists of 19 items and two factors, but the criteria for item elimination in the exploratory factor analysis are not clearly explained.

The criteria for item removal have been specified in the Data Analysis section, since the Instruments section only includes information about the final version of the scale.

7. It is recommended to include a measurement invariance analysis, as no evidence of external validity (relationship with other variables) is presented.

The sixth paragraph of the Data Analysis section explains how external validity was estimated.

Results

8. In the convergent validity section, the GAD-7 scale is mentioned, but it is not included in the instruments section. This should be addressed. Additionally, the methods section should specify how convergent validity was assessed.

We appreciate the recommendations provided, which have been implemented in the Instruments section. Additionally, the analysis plan now describes how external validity in relation to other variables was determined.

9. Table 6 repeats information already presented in the text; its inclusion may not be necessary.

Thank you for the recommendation; Table 6 has been removed, while its interpretation has been retained in the Results section.

10. Table 5 could be incorporated into the text. Consider whether a separate table is warranted for these values.

Table 5 has been removed, and the writing related to reliability has been improved in the Results section.

11. It is unclear how the decision to eliminate item C11 was made. Please clarify the criteria for item elimination in the methods section and further explain this decision in the results section.
A description of the reasons for removing item 11 has been added to the analysis plan and clarified in the Results section.

12. The goodness-of-fit indices for the model with all items and the model without item C11 are very similar. The rationale for its removal is not sufficiently clear. Please provide a stronger justification.

We made a material error when entering the RMSEA value as 0.098. This has been corrected based on the statistical analyses. The primary reason for removing the item was to reduce the RMSEA to a value below 0.08. It is worth noting that this item already had a factor loading below 0.30, which technically disqualified it from remaining in the model.

Discussion
13. The discussion is relevant but lacks a more extensive comparison with previous studies that have developed similar scales in Latin American contexts.
We appreciate the observation. Although an exhaustive search was conducted, only a limited number of previous studies were identified, particularly those with comparable population characteristics. Nevertheless, the available studies were incorporated to enrich the discussion and highlight similarities in terms of factorial structure and psychometric properties.

14. The study's limitations section should acknowledge that measurement invariance was not assessed. It is strongly recommended to include this analysis, as it would strengthen the manuscript.
Due to certain limitations, we appreciate the recommendation and have added a note indicating that future studies could address this. We have also explained the reasons why we were unable to perform measurement invariance analysis.

15. Consider expanding the discussion with explicit comparisons between the SRCAA and other validated scales in Latin American populations.

So far, no validated scales have been identified in Latin American populations that specifically measure the same construct as the SRCAA in groups with comparable population characteristics. This absence limits the possibility of making direct comparisons. However, some scales that aim to measure similar constructs in comparable populations will be briefly mentioned.

References
16. The references should follow APA 7 format, as required by the journal. Not all references include a DOI or complete information. Additionally, some in-text citations lack corresponding references at the end of the manuscript. Ensure that all in-text citations have a corresponding reference in the reference list.
Each citation included in the manuscript has its corresponding reference, all formatted according to APA 7th edition guidelines.