González-Rivera, J. (2023). Dissociative Experiences Scale: Psychometric Analysis in Puerto Rico and Contributions to the Discussion of the Factor Structure. *Interacciones, 9*, e360. http://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2023.v9.260

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.

González-Rivera, J. (2023). Dissociative Experiences Scale: Psychometric Analysis in Puerto Rico and Contributions to the Discussion of the Factor Structure. *Interacciones*, *9*, e360. http://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2023.v9.260

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:	It was added that the sample size was assessed as adequate
1. In the participant's section, I recommend that	for the AFC.
authors assess the statistical potential. They	Page 7 and 9.
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".	It was added that it was measured in dollars and the dollar
However, it is difficult to estimate this amount as	sign was added to the amounts (\$).
the unit of measurement (dollars?) is not	Page 5
available.	
3. The author said: "maximum likelihood	This is precisely why the Satorra and Bentler (2001)
estimation". However, as the authors' data did	corrections were used. Satorra and Bentler corrections are
not show multivariate normality, would the use	adjustments applied in confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to
of MLR (robust version) not be appropriate?	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	The citation requested by the reviewer was included.
by calculating the mean of the scores of the 28	(Putnam et al., 1996).
items and can range from 0 to 100, where scores	Page 6.
of 30 or more indicate high levels of	
dissociation." However, it's necessary to add a	
reference that supports the statement.	((AAD))
RESULTS	"MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor
5. Authors should add the meaning of the MB	model. And its meaning was included in the Tables as
measure in the notes to the tables 2 and 3.	requested by the reviewer.

Page 9 and 10. GL' was replaced by "DF". Page 10. 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 the control items were dropped and what the criteria for dropping the items were. Please explain in more detail. 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 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 (MB)", so suggested by Dominguez-Lara and Rodriguez (2017). The BM presented more acceptable fit indices than the M4 (CFIsb = .93; TLIS = .93; TMSEAS = .05). Statistical indicators examining the robustness of the GF conclude in favor of the unidimensionality of the DES-II (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). Lunderstand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. "MB" was	Reviewers' Comments	Modifications and authors' responses
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. ### 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 AVS and ASVs drastically exceeded the AVS 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: #### 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 (MBM), as suggested by Dominguez-Lara and Rodriguez (2017). The BM presented more acceptable findices than the four specific factors (SF) (see Table 4). To analyze this GF, I used a bifactor or direct hierarchical modeling (MBM), as suggested by Dominguez-Lara and Rodriguez (2017). The SM pre		Page 9 and 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 the factor screen 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. The high compared to the activation and ability (Moral de la Rubia, 2019). However, all MSVs and ASVs drastically exceeded the AVEs, indicating an absence of divergent validity in the scale 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 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 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 evidence convergent validity (Moral de la Rubia, 2019). However, all however, all however, all however, all however, all however, Table 4 contains all the statistical data to	6. The tables say "GL" but should be "df" of	GL" was replaced by "DF".
and no items were eliminated. In this model, as explained in Table 2, the 28 items organized in 4 factors are maintaining 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. 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 Rodríguez (2017). The BM presented more acceptable thic 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 (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model, since it has 28 items and is too large. It is not visually app	degrees of freedom.	Page 10.
eliminating items. This model includes four dimensions or factors: absorption, ammesia, 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. ### 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 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 Ia 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 in the data. The high compared to the total variance in the data. The high correlations between 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 of 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 (MBM), as suggested by Dominiquez-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). ### Understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. ### "I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. ### "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. ### "A underst	7. The authors say "Model M4 was the only	Clarification. The M4 model did not receive any changes
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. ### 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: ###################################	model that showed adequate fit indices without	and no items were eliminated. In this model, as explained
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 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 (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model.	eliminating items. This model includes four	in Table 2, the 28 items organized in 4 factors are
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 (CPIsb = .93; TUsb = .91; RMSEAsb = .05). Statistical indicators examining the robustness of the GF conclude in favor of the unidimensionality of the DES-II (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. **MB** was replaced by "BM** which stands for bifactor model.** "MB** was replaced by "BM** which stands for bifactor model.** "MB** was replaced by "BM** which stands for bifactor model.** "MB** was replaced by bown in an academic manuscript. However, Table 4 contains all the statistical data to	dimensions or factors: absorption, amnesia,	maintained. It presented a good fit, but its problem was
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 Ia 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. *MB* was replaced by "BM* which stands for bifactor model. *Indicator seamining 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. *Indicator seamining the robustness of the GF conclude in favor of the unidimensionality of the DES-II (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include the Figure of the bifactor model, since it has 28 it	I	=
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 (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. *MB* was replaced by "BM* which stands for bifactor model. *"MB* was replaced by "BM* which stands for bifactor model. *"MB* was replaced by "BM* which stands for bifactor model. *"Absumption 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	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
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; TIIsb = .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. **MB** was replaced by "BM** which stands for bifactor model.** "MB** was replaced by "BM** which stands for 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	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
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 (wh = .93; ECV = .81; PUC = .78; H = .96). I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this reason, I decided not to include additional explanations. *MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was templaced by "BM" which stands for 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		
"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) (ser 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 (\omega h = .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? 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	detail.	
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. "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		This paragraph explains the following and I quote:
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. "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		"The AVEs of the four dimensions of the M4 fluctuated
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 di		
(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 (wh = .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? 9. I recommend adding a figure with the factor structure of the bifactor model. 1 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		
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. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for 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		
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. *MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for 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		
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. #MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for 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		divergent validity in the scale and suggesting that the
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 (wh = .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? 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		variance not explained by the latent variables is high
(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. **MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for bifactor model. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for 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		compared to the total variance in the data. The high
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? 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		correlations between the latent variables in the M4 model
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" 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		
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? 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		
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 (\omega h = .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? 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		
(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? 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		
(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? 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		_
the M4 (CFIsb = .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? 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		
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? 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		
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? 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		
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. I decided not to include additional explanations. "MB" was replaced by "BM" which stands for 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		_
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? 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		
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. 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		.61, PUC76, N90).
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. 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		I understand that the explanation is detailed; for this
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. 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		reason, I decided not to include additional explanations.
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. 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	8. The authors say "Lused a hifactor or direct	"MR" was replaced by "RM" which stands for hifactor
"BM" for bifactor model? 9. I recommend adding a figure with the factor structure of the bifactor model. 1 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	<u> </u>	
structure 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		inder.
appealing enough to be shown in an academic manuscript. However, Table 4 contains all the statistical data to	9. I recommend adding a figure with the factor	I decided not to include the Figure of the bifactor model,
However, Table 4 contains all the statistical data to	structure 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.
understand the bifactor model.		understand the bifactor model.