REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:
In general, the manuscript is well-written and uses a sound methodological strategy. I would recommend some aspects for strengthening the manuscript before publication.

METHODS
1. In the participant's section, I recommend that authors assess the statistical potential. They should add whether they have a sufficient sample size for the CFA. For example, with the number of participants you will manage to have adequate CFI values. I suggest this online calculator to do the estimation: https://wnarifin.github.io/ssc_web.html
2. In table 1, they point out "annual income". However, it is difficult to estimate this amount as the unit of measurement (dollars?) is not available.
3. The author said: “maximum likelihood estimation”. However, as the authors' data did not show multivariate normality, would the use of MLR (robust version) not be appropriate?
4. The authors said: “The total score is obtained by calculating the mean of the scores of the 28 items and can range from 0 to 100, where scores of 30 or more indicate high levels of dissociation.” However, it's necessary to add a reference that supports the statement.

RESULTS
5. Authors should add the meaning of the MB measure in the notes to the tables 2 and 3.
6. The tables say "GL" but should be "df" of degrees of freedom.
7. The authors say “Model M4 was the only model that showed adequate fit indices without eliminating items. This model includes four dimensions or factors: absorption, amnesia, depersonalization/realization, and distractibility.” However, it is unclear which items were dropped and what the criteria for dropping the items were. Please explain in more detail.
8. The authors say “I used a bifactor or direct hierarchical modeling (MB)”, but it should be "BM" for bifactor model?
9. I recommend adding a figure with the factor structure of the bifactor model.

Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?

No.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

November 2, 2023

Dr. David Villarreal
Editor de Interacciones
Instituto Peruano de Orientación Psicológica

Dear doctor:

After attending to the recommendations offered by the reviewers, I break down the changes made to the original version of my manuscript in the following table, accompanied by my commentary and changes made (repeated comments between reviewers were omitted). The recommendations were very sound and strengthened the manuscript. All changes are marked in red.

Thank you again for the opportunity.

I remain at your service,

Dr. Juan A. González Rivera

Reviewers' Comments	Modifications and authors' responses
METHODS: 1. In the participant's section, I recommend that authors assess the statistical potential. They should add whether they have a sufficient sample size for the CFA. For example, with the number of participants you will manage to have adequate CFI values. I suggest this online calculator to do the estimation: https://wnarifin.github.io/ssc_web.html	It was added that the sample size was assessed as adequate for the AFC. Page 7 and 9.
2. In table 1, they point out "annual income". However, it is difficult to estimate this amount as the unit of measurement (dollars?) is not available.	It was added that it was measured in dollars and the dollar sign was added to the amounts ($). Page 5
3. The author said: “maximum likelihood estimation”. However, as the authors' data did not show multivariate normality, would the use of MLR (robust version) not be appropriate?	This is precisely why the Satorra and Bentler (2001) corrections were used. Satorra and Bentler corrections are adjustments applied in confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to improve model fit estimates when certain statistical conditions, such as multivariate normality of the data, are violated. These corrections modify the χ^2 statistic and related fit indices to compensate for non-normality and other model specification problems.
4. The authors said: “The total score is obtained by calculating the mean of the scores of the 28 items and can range from 0 to 100, where scores of 30 or more indicate high levels of dissociation.” However, it's necessary to add a reference that supports the statement.	The citation requested by the reviewer was included. (Putnam et al., 1996). Page 6.
RESULTS 5. Authors should add the meaning of the MB measure in the notes to the tables 2 and 3.	“MB” was replaced by “BM” which stands for bifactor model. And its meaning was included in the Tables as requested by the reviewer.

Reviewers' Comments	Modifications and authors' responses
	Page 9 and 10.
6. The tables say "GL" but should be "df" of degrees of freedom.	GL" was replaced by "DF". Page 10.
7. The authors say “Model M4 was the only model that showed adequate fit indices without eliminating items. This model includes four dimensions or factors: absorption, amnesia, depersonalization/realization, and distractibility.” However, it is unclear which items were dropped and what the criteria for dropping the items were. Please explain in more detail.	Clarification. The M4 model did not receive any changes and no items were eliminated. In this model, as explained in Table 2, the 28 items organized in 4 factors are maintained. It presented a good fit, but its problem was that "all MSVs and ASVs drastically exceeded the AVEs, indicating an absence of divergent validity in the scale and suggesting that the variance not explained by the latent variables is high compared to the total variance in the data". This is explained in the paragraph following Table 3. This paragraph explains the following and I quote: "The AVEs of the four dimensions of the M4 fluctuated between .44 and .56 (see Table 4), so they can be considered adequate and evidence convergent validity (Moral de la Rubia, 2019). However, all MSVs and ASVs drastically exceeded the AVEs, indicating an absence of divergent validity in the scale and suggesting that the variance not explained by the latent variables is high compared to the total variance in the data. The high correlations between the latent variables in the M4 model (between .76 and .95) point to the presence of a possible GF that I can label as dissociation or dissociative experiences and that explains more variance in the items than the four specific factors (SF) (see Table 4). To analyze this GF, I used a bifactor or direct hierarchical modeling (BM), as suggested by Dominguez-Lara and Rodriguez (2017). The BM presented more acceptable fit indices than the M4 (CFIsb = .93; TLIsb = .91; RMSEAsb = .05). Statistical indicators examining the robustness of the GF conclude in favor of the unidimensionality of the DES-II (ωh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations.
8. The authors say “I used a bifactor or direct hierarchical modeling (MB)”, but it should be "BM" for bifactor model?	“MB” was replaced by “BM” which stands for bifactor model.
9. I recommend adding a figure with the factor structure of the bifactor model.	I decided not to include the Figure of the bifactor model, since it has 28 items and is too large. It is not visually appealing enough to be shown in an academic manuscript. However, Table 4 contains all the statistical data to understand the bifactor model.