LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:
Please find my comments and suggestions below. I hope they are helpful in strengthening the manuscript.

Style
1. One minor stylistic point concerns the frequent use of first-person singular ("I") throughout the abstract, methods, instruments, and results sections. The authors may wish to consider revising these passages for stylistic consistency with common reporting conventions.
For example, statements such as "I recruited," "I estimated," or "I administered" could be reformulated using passive or neutral constructions (e.g., "participants were recruited," "models were estimated," "the scale was administered"), without altering the substantive content.
Introduction
2. While the introduction provides a strong rationale for assessing flourishing, the construct itself could be more explicitly defined. A concise conceptual definition of flourishing, and its operationalization in the Flourishing Scale, would help anchor the subsequent psychometric analyses.
3. In the fourth paragraph of the Introduction, the rhetorical question ("Why validate the FS specifically among LGBT/SGM populations?") is stylistically unnecessary and can be removed by reformulating the paragraph in a declarative manner without loss of content.
4. Detailed descriptions of the PHQ-8 and GAD-7 are provided both in the seventh paragraph of the Introduction and in the Methods section, resulting in redundancy. The Introduction could be shortened by removing these descriptions and reserving instrument specific details for the Methods section.
5. The paragraph beginning with "From an equity perspective…" introduces important considerations related to public policy and service implications. However, this material is more typical of a Discussion section. The authors may wish to condense this paragraph to one or two sentences or relocate part of its content to the Discussion in order to maintain a sharper focus in the Introduction.
Results
6. Given the sample size, the extensive reporting of normality tests in the Results section may be unnecessary. This section could be shortened by focusing on descriptive indices and the rationale for robust estimation.
7. The configural models for both gender and sexual orientation show relatively weak absolute fit (e.g., RMSEA > .10; TLI < .90). Given this weak baseline fit, claims of invariance across gender and sexual orientation are not fully supported. The authors are therefore encouraged to either provide a stronger justification for these invariance claims or to revise the interpretation accordingly.
Discussion
8. The Discussion would benefit from a clearer alignment with the invariance results reported. Given the weak absolute fit of the configural models, statements regarding measurement invariance across gender and sexual orientation should be revised. The authors are encouraged to either (a) provide a stronger justification for these interpretations, (b) explicitly frame invariance related conclusions as limitations, or (c) remove or substantially temper claims that are not fully supported by the data.

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?
Yes, I agree to have my name indicated as a reviewer.

González-Rivera, J. (2026). Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population. *Interacciones, 12*, e501. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.501

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:
Title and Abstract
1. I suggest limiting the title to "Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population," as the information about the population is already repeated in the abstract.
2. It seems that the abstract is missing an introduction section.

Method
3. It would be necessary to indicate the ethics committee approval code.}
4. The authors state, "subgroup analyses were restricted to categories with sufficient sample sizes to support stable model estimation and interpretable invariance decisions." However, they do not specify how the sample size was calculated for the CFA (e.g., wnarifin.github.io/ssc_web.html) or for the correlation analysis. I suggest indicating the minimum sample size required for the main analyses. For example:
"To obtain a minimum CFI of 0.95, at least 140 participants were estimated, assuming 8 items, average factor loadings of 0.7, a significance level of 0.05, and 80% power."
5. The type of sampling should be indicated.

González-Rivera, J. (2026). Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population. *Interacciones, 12*, e501. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.501

Dear Editor and Reviewer A,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled "Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population" (ID-501). I appreciate the constructive feedback from the reviewers and have carefully addressed each comment. All revisions have been incorporated into the manuscript, and changes are indicated using highlighting (red) as requested. Below, I provide a detailed point-by-point response describing how each comment was addressed and where the change appears in the revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Juan González-Rivera, Psy.D.

Reviewer A — Responses

A1. Style: frequent use of first-person singular ("I")

Comment: The manuscript frequently uses first-person singular ("I") across sections. Please revise for stylistic consistency with common reporting conventions.

Response: I agree and revised the Abstract, Methods, Instruments, and Results to remove first-person singular constructions. Statements such as "I recruited," "I estimated," "I administered," and "I report" were reformulated using neutral/passive reporting language (e.g., "participants were recruited," "models were estimated," "the instrument was administered," "χ^2 differences were reported").

A2. Introduction: define flourishing more explicitly and clarify operationalization in the FS

Comment: The construct of flourishing should be more explicitly defined; clarify operationalization in the FS.

Response: I added a concise conceptual definition of flourishing and clarified that the FS operationalizes flourishing through eight Likert-type indicators typically modeled as a single latent factor, anchoring subsequent psychometric analyses.

A3. Introduction: remove rhetorical question ("Why validate…?")

Comment: The rhetorical question is stylistically unnecessary.

Response: I removed the rhetorical question and rewrote the paragraph in declarative form without loss of content, retaining the conceptual distinction between mean differences and measurement equivalence.

A4. Introduction: redundancy in PHQ-8 and GAD-7 descriptions

Comment: PHQ-8 and GAD-7 descriptions are redundant across Introduction and Methods.

Response: I shortened the Introduction by removing detailed PHQ-8/GAD-7 descriptions and retained instrument-specific details exclusively in Methods → Instruments. The Introduction now states only the purpose of using PHQ-8 and GAD-7 as external criteria and the expected direction of associations.

A5. Introduction: "From an equity perspective…" paragraph is better suited for Discussion

Comment: The paragraph introduces important public policy and service implications but is more typical of a Discussion section.

Response: I agree. The equity/policy content was removed from the Introduction and incorporated into the Discussion under Practical Implications as a separate paragraph.

A6. Results: extensive reporting of normality tests

Comment: Extensive normality testing may be unnecessary; shorten and focus on rationale for robust estimation.

Response: I streamlined the Results section by summarizing item-level distributional departures using descriptive indices (skewness/kurtosis ranges) and emphasizing multivariate non-normality using omnibus multivariate tests. I removed item-by-item normality testing from the narrative and retained detailed indices in Table 2. I explicitly linked these results to the choice of robust estimation and sensitivity analyses.

A7. Invariance: weak absolute fit of configural models undermines invariance claims

Comment: Configural models show weak absolute fit (e.g., RMSEA > .10; TLI < .90); invariance claims need stronger justification or revised interpretation.

González-Rivera, J. (2026). Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population. *Interacciones, 12*, e501. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.501

> **Response:** I revised the Measurement Invariance Results to explicitly acknowledge weak absolute fit of the multigroup configural models and tempered the interpretation accordingly. I now frame invariance-related conclusions as **preliminary**, emphasizing that fit-change patterns were broadly consistent with approximate invariance but that weak baseline fit limits the strength of inference.

A8. Discussion: align interpretation with invariance results; temper claims or frame as limitations

> **Comment:** Discussion should reflect weak configural fit; revise or temper invariance conclusions.
> **Response:** I revised the Discussion to align with the invariance results. Strong statements implying "unbiased" subgroup comparisons were removed or tempered. I added an explicit limitation noting weak absolute fit of configural multigroup models and recommended replication with improved baseline multigroup models, alternative categorical estimators when appropriate, and larger subgroup samples.

Reviewer C — Responses

C1. Title: shorten to reduce redundancy

> **Comment:** Limit title to "Psychometric Validation of the Flourishing Scale among LGBT Population."
> **Response:** I revised the title as suggested to reduce redundancy with the Abstract.

C2. Abstract: missing an introduction section

> **Comment:** The abstract appears to be missing an introduction.
> **Response:** I added a brief 1–2 sentence background at the beginning of the Abstract to contextualize flourishing and the need for FS validation in LGBT/SGM populations in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean. The same enhancement was applied to the Spanish resumen for consistency.

C3. Methods: indicate ethics committee approval code

> **Comment:** Provide ethics committee approval code.
> **Response:** I added the IRB approval code to the Methods section.

C4. Methods: specify minimum sample size required for CFA and correlations; describe how calculated

> **Comment:** Specify how sample size was calculated for CFA and correlational analyses, and report minimum required N.
> **Response:** I added a sample size planning subsection describing the assumptions used for CFA sample size adequacy and explicitly reporting the minimum required N (cross-checked using Arifin's SEM/CFA sample size calculator). I also added a brief power-based justification for correlation analyses indicating that the available sample (N = 300) exceeded the minimum needed to detect small-to-moderate associations at α = .05 with 80% power.

C5. Methods: indicate type of sampling

> **Comment:** The type of sampling should be indicated.
> **Response:** I clarified that the study used a non-probability, convenience (self-selected), non-stratified online sampling approach, and I described the eligibility criteria and subgroup restrictions for invariance testing due to cell size limitations