

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated

Novelty: Moderated

Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:

1. I would recommend a shorter title, such as "Psychometric Properties of the Test of Mobile Phone Dependence Brief (TMDBrief) in College Students."
2. The abstract should explicitly state the study design, for example, cross-sectional study.
3. Keywords: Verify that they correspond to DeCS/MeSH terms.
4. In the introduction, it would be desirable to include updated data on the prevalence of problematic smartphone use in Peru or Latin America to strengthen the local relevance of the study.
5. The introduction should end with a clear and direct paragraph outlining the objectives, differentiating the methodological aspects (factor structure, reliability, convergent validity, and measurement invariance).
6. In the methods section, a complete reference to the DSM-IV should be added. Additionally, no abbreviation should be used without a prior explanation.
7. In the participants section, it is unclear how statistical power was calculated to determine the sample size. Assume a CFI of 0.95. I suggest using this calculator:
https://wnarifin.shinyapps.io/ss_sem_cfi_unequal/
8. The participants section mentions exclusions but does not specify how many participants were excluded or the specific criteria used. Additionally, a sensitivity analysis of these exclusions is not provided.
9. Although it is mentioned that the questionnaires were administered via Google Forms, the procedures for ensuring data quality should be detailed (e.g., control of multiple responses, response times, or mandatory questions).
10. It is recommended to specify whether electronic informed consent was obtained and how data confidentiality was protected in digital environments.
11. In the limitations section, it should be added that the sampling was non-probabilistic.
12. In the discussion section, it is suggested to add a subsection on practical implications or prevention strategies in university settings.

RESPONSE LETTER

Response to reviewers

We sincerely thank you for the time and thoughtful effort you dedicated to reviewing our manuscript. Your comments and suggestions were insightful and constructive, and they significantly contributed to improving the quality and clarity of our work. Below, we detail the changes made in response to each of your recommendations. We hope these revisions address your concerns and reflect our appreciation for your valuable feedback.

1. I would recommend a shorter title, such as “Psychometric Properties of the Test of Mobile Phone Dependence Brief (TMDBrief) in College Students.”

Thank you for your thoughtful suggestion. We agree that brevity in titles can enhance clarity and readability. However, we would respectfully prefer to retain the inclusion of the country (“Peruvian College Students”) as we believe it provides important contextual and methodological information for readers.

The TMDbrief has been validated in multiple countries (e.g., Pakistan, Italy, Argentina, Portugal), and indicating the country in the title clearly signals that this is a country-specific validation. This helps differentiate it from prior studies and may be especially useful for researchers conducting cross-cultural comparisons or meta-analyses.

We hope this rationale is acceptable and remain open to further suggestions if needed.

2. The abstract should explicitly state the study design, for example, cross-sectional study.

Thank you for this observation. The abstract has been revised to explicitly state the study design.

3. Keywords: Verify that they correspond to DeCS/MeSH terms.

Thank you for this observation. The keywords have been reviewed in accordance with the indexed terms in the DeCS/MeSH vocabulary and have been modified accordingly. The term “Peruvian college students” has been retained as a keyword, according with what was stated in point number one. If it is necessary to modify any keyword, we are willing to identify and include alternative options.

4. In the introduction, it would be desirable to include updated data on the prevalence of problematic smartphone use in Peru or Latin America to strengthen the local relevance of the study. (Page 2, paragraph 5)

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In response, we have incorporated updated data on the prevalence of problematic smartphone use in Latin America. This addition appears in the third paragraph of the Introduction.

5. The introduction should end with a clear and direct paragraph outlining the objectives, differentiating the methodological aspects (factor structure, reliability, convergent validity, and measurement invariance). (page 4, paragraph 3)

Thank you for this valuable suggestion. In response, we have revised the final paragraph of the introduction to clearly present the specific objectives of the study, highlighting the methodological components: factor structure, internal consistency, convergent validity, and measurement invariance. We believe this change improves the clarity and focus of the study’s aims.

6. In the methods section, a complete reference to the DSM-IV should be added. Additionally, no abbreviation should be used without a prior explanation. (page 5, paragraph 3)

Thank you for your observation. We have now included the full citation of the DSM-IV in the methods section and added the complete reference in the reference list (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Additionally, we clarified the abbreviation SMS (Short Message Service) at its first mention in the introduction.

7. In the participants section, it is unclear how statistical power was calculated to determine the sample size. Assume a CFI of 0.95. I suggest using this calculator: https://wnarifin.shinyapps.io/ss_sem_cfi_unequal/ (page 6, paragraph 3)

Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have now included a description of the power analysis in the first paragraph of Data Analysis section, using the online calculator you recommended (Arifin, 2025),

based on the method by Kim (2005). Assuming a CFI of .95, a power of .80, and our model's degrees of freedom, the required sample size was estimated at 229. Our final sample of 954 participants exceeded this requirement, ensuring sufficient statistical power.

8. The participants section mentions exclusions but does not specify how many participants were excluded or the specific criteria used. Additionally, a sensitivity analysis of these exclusions is not provided. (page 5, paragraph 1)

Thank you for your observation. We have revised the *Participants* section to specify the exclusion criteria and clarify that fewer than 2% of cases were excluded. Given the minimal proportion, we noted that a sensitivity analysis was not deemed necessary, as these exclusions were unlikely to affect the results.

9. Although it is mentioned that the questionnaires were administered via Google Forms, the procedures for ensuring data quality should be detailed (e.g., control of multiple responses, response times, or mandatory questions). (page 6, paragraph 2)

Thank you for highlighting this point. The Procedures section has been updated to specify that all questionnaire items were configured as mandatory in Google Forms to ensure complete responses, and that participants were instructed to submit the survey only once.

10. It is recommended to specify whether electronic informed consent was obtained and how data confidentiality was protected in digital environments.

Thank you for this important point. The manuscript has been updated to clarify that electronic informed consent was obtained via Google Forms, and that all survey responses were anonymous. Data were stored on a password-protected server accessible only to the research team.

11. In the limitations section, it should be added that the sampling was non-probabilistic. (page 13, paragraph 3)

Thank you for the observation. We have now added to the limitations section that the study used a non-probabilistic sampling method, which may affect the generalizability of the findings.

12. In the discussion section, it is suggested to add a subsection on practical implications or prevention strategies in university settings. (page 13, paragraph 2)

Thank you for your valuable suggestion. In response, we have added a subsection titled *Practical Implications and Prevention Strategies* to the Discussion section. This addition outlines evidence-based interventions that universities can implement to address smartphone addiction, and highlights the potential use of the TMDbrief for early screening and ongoing monitoring.