

Supplementary material 1. Peer-review process.

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance
Very high

Novelty
High

Presentation and writing
Very high

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

I have been asked to review the manuscript entitled "Psychometric properties of the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale in Peruvian university students: Evidence from CFA, psychometric network modeling, and DIF", which aims to examine the psychometric properties of the scale in Peruvian university students through an integrated approach combining confirmatory factor analysis, psychometric network modeling, and differential item functioning.

The study addresses a relevant and socially pertinent topic for the Peruvian and Latin American context, and presents a methodologically novel approach by integrating classical and contemporary techniques in psychometrics. The structure of the manuscript is clear and follows the expected guidelines for a validation study. Below, I present a series of observations and suggestions organized by section, which I believe can contribute to improving the quality of the research and the manuscript.

ABSTRACT

- The authors mention that items pi2 and pi3 present uniform DIF. I consider that, for greater precision, it would be useful to briefly comment on the direction of this bias (e.g., men tend to score higher than women on these items, at the same level of the trait). Although this is explained in the discussion, including it in the abstract would make it even more self-contained.
- In the abstract, the authors state that the scale demonstrates "solid evidence of validity and reliability," but the RMSEA is 0.82 (Upper limit CI = 0.104) and 0.10 for the two-dimensional and one-dimensional models, respectively. According to the criteria of Hu & Bentler (1999; <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>), values > 0.08 fall within the acceptable limit or are at least not entirely optimal. Therefore, it is recommended to moderate the language to "acceptable evidence" instead of "solid."

INTRODUCTION

- The authors describe the phenomenon of prejudice and discrimination very well in the introduction. However, for a reader in psychometrics, it might be beneficial to explicitly link the definition of "attitude" with its operationalization in the scale. For example, they could mention that the scale measures a cognitive component (stereotypes) and a behavioral component (such as disposition towards interaction/avoidance) or an affective component (such as discomfort), which could align with classical tripartite models of attitudes.
- I consider that the authors do not sufficiently problematize why they integrate EGA + CFA. In this sense, what does the psychometric network contribute compared to traditional SEM?
- Although the authors clearly state the objective, I believe the manuscript could benefit from including explicit

research hypotheses, derived from theory and previous evidence.

MeTHODOLOGY

Participants

- The subtitle for participants should be in English: "Participants."
- There is a minor contradiction in the exclusion criteria: in "Participantes," it states, "The exclusion criteria considered were: students over 18 years of age...". This is incorrect; they probably meant "inclusion." It should be corrected to: "The inclusion criteria were: students over 18 years of age...".

Instrument

- It is necessary to explain the instrument a little more: how are the scores obtained from the factors interpreted?
- It would be good to add examples of items for each dimension.
- It is not mentioned in the introduction, but it should be mentioned in what type of population the validation carried out by González-Fócil (2016) was conducted.
- The authors indicate that they carried out a validation by expert judges. What criteria did the judges use to evaluate the items? What scores did they provide? What profiles did the judges meet to be selected? This should be described in the procedure sub-section.

Data analysis

- Regarding the criteria to consider for factorial equivalence, the authors have not highlighted the criterion for change to consider for the TLI; please review.
- The "DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT" section says "Not applicable." Although the data may not be made public for confidentiality reasons, I recommend that the authors include a statement similar to this: "The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions." Furthermore, I consider that it would be an enormous added value to include the R code used for the analyses as supplementary material. This would guarantee the total reproducibility of the study.

RESULTS

- In the descriptive analysis of Table 2, it is mentioned that the variances show "absence of range restriction." While it is an indicator, it is preferable to speak of "adequate dispersion" or directly of "sufficient variability," since range restriction is better evaluated by comparing with the theoretical scale (1-5).
- In Table 2, the third row uses σ to refer to the standard deviation, but the table note identifies it as " σ^2 = variance." Correct this.
- The paragraph on network invariance by sex mentions the following: "...networks for women (0) and men (1),..." but in the figures of Figure 2, they are numbered as 1 and 2. Make the correction to identify which figure corresponds.
- It strikes me that the EGA shows 1 dimension and the CFA supports a 2-dimensional structure more. Why do the authors not report the correlation between the factors? This difference between EGA and CFA could indicate high interfactor correlation. The authors should explicitly explain in the discussion the difference between community detection and factor modeling.
- It strikes me that in the network model, there are items that show redundancy, specifically π_3 and π_4 , which have a value ranging from moderate to high. In the confirmatory factor analysis, were modification indices not evaluated to determine possible significant covariances between the items in the two-dimensional model?
- Since the confirmed factorial model is not visualized in any figure, it would be interesting for the authors to narrate the factor loadings, at least the minimum and maximum per factor.
- In the factorial invariance analysis, I consider that it would be interesting to add the p-value between the nested models, even if it is not a criterion to consider and is affected by the sample size; it provides information.

DISCUSSION

- It strikes me that the authors mention that the scale shows no differences by sex, which I feel is too strong a conclusion considering the DIF detected. I believe they could comment that "global invariance is supported, with

localized item bias."

- It strikes me that in the discussion, the authors focus on the presence of DIF, but not on its magnitude: is it small, moderate, or large DIF? Although the chi-square test is significant, it could be complemented with an effect size. This would help readers understand whether this detected bias, although real, is large enough to require immediate action or whether semantic refinement is sufficient. The authors could mention this as a limitation and suggest its analysis in future studies.
- In the discussion of Figure 1 and the CFA results, it would be good to mention that, despite the preference for the two-dimensional model, the perfect structural stability found in bootEGA is a notable strength of the scale, as it indicates that the organization of the items around a central construct is highly replicable.
- In the limitations, some important ones are missing, such as social desirability bias, the self-report nature of the scale, the failure to report the interfactor correlation, in addition to not discussing the borderline RMSEA.

REFERENCES

It is recommended that the authors conduct an exhaustive review of the references to ensure consistency with APA 7th edition format, as some citations and references were identified that do not conform to this guideline. Below are some specific inconsistencies as examples; however, it is suggested that the authors carry out a complete audit of the reference list to ensure its correct formatting.

- Review the citation "Recasens, 2020" as it is referenced as "Viola Recasens, A. (2020)..."
- Review the following citation "Ministerio de Cultura Perú, 2018" as it is referenced as "Ministerio de cultura (Perú). (2018)..."
- Review the following citation "Indecopi, 2015" as it seems to be referenced under another author's name. The only reference where it is found is: Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual. (2015). Discriminación en el consumo y trato diferenciado ilícito en la jurisprudencia del Indecopi. Indecopi. <http://hdl.handle.net/11724/4973>
- Review the following citation "CEPAL, 2016" as, although it exists, the author's name in the reference appears as: "CEPAL, Comisión Económica para América Latina (2016)".
- Review the following citation "Rstudio Team, 2024" as it is referenced as "R Core Team. (2024)..."
- The citation "Merino-Soto and Livia-Segovia (2009)" is referenced differently: "Soto, C. M., & Segovia, J. L. (2009)..."
- The following reference appears twice: "Magis, D., Beland, S., Tuerlinckx, F., & De Boeck, P. (2010)..."
- The following citation is not referenced: "Vandenberg & Lance, 2000..."
- Review the following citation "WHO, 2008" as it appears referenced as "World Health Organization. (2008)..."
- This reference is not cited: "Civalero, L., Alonso, D., & Brussino, S. (2019). Evaluación del prejuicio hacia inmigrantes: adaptación argentina de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto. *Ciencias Psicológicas*, 13(1), 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.22235/cp.v13i1.1814>".

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.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance

High

Novelty

High

Presentation and writing

High

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

1. Writing and content observations:

- In the participants section, the statement that the study sample consisted of 306 university students is repeated. It should be stated only once.
- Do not state in the same section that individuals who did not wish to participate were excluded. This is implicit, ethically appropriate, and it is later indicated that participation was voluntary.
- When describing the procedure, it is sufficient to state that Google Forms was used; there is no need to include the link <https://forms.gle/uENWCKqNTiyv5yUE8>.
- In the Discussion section, statistical values should not be introduced. The appropriate section for this information is the Results section.
- Explicitly refer to the non-probabilistic nature of the sample as a limitation, not only to the fact that it consisted of university students.
- Another potential limitation concerns the biases inherent in self-report measures, such as social desirability when responding to the instrument.

2. Observations regarding presentation standards (APA):

- The abstract is unusually long, exceeding the journal's recommended limit of 300 words, and should therefore be shortened.
- The subsections of the data analysis should not be numbered, as the subsections of the results are not. The guidelines regarding heading levels indicated in the APA manual should be followed.
- Table 6 must be presented and referenced in the text.
- In citations, do not use the form "et al.'s"; use only "et al."
- I did not find citations associated with the following references; please verify:
 - Civalero, L., Alonso, D., & Brussino, S. (2019)
 - Viola Recasens, A. (2020)
 - Pedersen et al. (2011)
 - Soto, C. M., & Segovia, J. L. (2009)
- I did not find references associated with the following citations; please verify:
 - Merino-Soto and Livia-Segovia (2009) → In the reference list it appears as Soto, C. M., & Segovia, J. L. (2009). These do not correspond.
 - Recasens (2020)
 - Vandenberg & Lance (2000)
- The reference must correspond exactly to what is stated in the citation. Please review: RStudio Team (2024). In addition, if surnames are separated by hyphens, they must appear in the same form in both citations and references.
- In the reference for Alcota et al. (2025), "DOI:" should not be included; instead, it should be presented directly in the format <https://doi.org/xxx>. Correct the format in: Viola Recasens, A. (2020).
- In the reference for Brown (2015), the place of publication (New York, NY) should not be included according to current guidelines. The same applies to CEPAL (2016).
- In the reference for Cárdenas (2007), prioritize the retrieval link from the journal itself rather than other links: <https://revistas.javeriana.edu.co/index.php/revPsycho/article/view/114>
- The structure of the following references is incorrect; please review the APA manual: Christensen, A. P. (2020); González Fócil, R. C. (2016).

Huamani-Cahua, J. C., Ordoño Ticona, Y., Viamonte Quispe, M. Y., Vega Carpio, N. B., & Ojeda-Flores, E. C. (2026). Psychometric properties of the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale in Peruvian university students: Evidence from factorial analysis, psychometric network modeling, and differential item functioning. *Interacciones*, 12, e514. <https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.514>

- A shorter link (optional) may be used for “de Veintimilla, A. M. (2024)”: <https://caapecuador.org/ecuador-debate-n-121/>
- In the reference for Soto, C. M., & Segovia, J. L. (2009), the title appears in English in brackets. Decide whether this practice will be applied consistently when presenting references originally published in Spanish.
- The reference for Magis et al. appears twice; please correct this duplication.

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.

RESPONSE LETTER

Response Letter to Reviewers Interacciones Journal

Manuscript: Psychometric properties of the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale in Peruvian university students: Evidence from CFA, psychometric network modeling, and DIF

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments on the manuscript. Below, we present detailed responses to each of the comments, indicating the modifications made to the document.

Reviewer 1

ABSTRACT

1. The authors mention that items π_2 and π_3 show uniform DIF. For greater precision, I believe it would be useful to briefly comment on the direction of this bias (for example, men tend to obtain higher scores than women on these items at the same trait level). Although this is explained in the discussion, including it in the abstract would make it even more self-contained.

Manuscript change

Uniform DIF was detected in two items (π_2 and π_3), with no evidence of non-uniform DIF, whereby men tend to obtain higher scores than women on these items even when they present the same level of the latent trait.

2. In the abstract, the authors state that the scale demonstrates “strong evidence of validity and reliability,” but the RMSEA is 0.82 (upper CI bound = 0.104) and 0.10 for the two-dimensional and one-dimensional models, respectively. According to Hu and Bentler’s (1999; <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>) criteria, values > 0.08 fall within the acceptable limit or are at least not entirely optimal. Therefore, it is recommended to moderate the language to “acceptable evidence” rather than “strong.”

Manuscript change

The scale shows acceptable evidence of validity and reliability.

INTRODUCTION

3. The authors describe the phenomenon of prejudice and discrimination very well in the introduction. However, for a reader with a background in psychometrics, it could be beneficial to explicitly link the definition of “attitude” to its operationalization in the scale. For example, the authors could mention that the scale measures a cognitive component (stereotypes) and a behavioral component (such as the disposition toward interaction/avoidance) or an affective component (such as discomfort), which could align with classic tripartite models of attitudes.

Manuscript change

In this regard, it is pertinent to have instruments that allow for a rigorous assessment of attitudes toward Indigenous people. According to González-Fócil (2016), attitudes are understood as learned psychological predispositions, theoretically composed of three components: the cognitive component, referring to conscious ideas, beliefs, and thoughts about the attitudinal object; the affective component, related to the feelings, emotions, and evaluative reactions it elicits; and the behavioral component, comprising the actions or behavioral intentions directed toward it. From this perspective, the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale was designed to measure negative dispositions expressed through prejudice and discriminatory practices in social interaction, through a multidimensional structure composed of two factors: Contact and Stereotypes, which assesses prejudiced attitudes based on traditional stereotypes and avoidance of contact with Indigenous people; and Intolerance and Inequity, which captures attitudes of intransigence and discrimination expressed through unequal treatment of this population group.

4. I believe the authors do not sufficiently problematize why they integrate EGA + CFA. In this regard, what does the psychometric network approach contribute in comparison with traditional SEM?

Manuscript change

In this context, the integration of Exploratory Graph Analysis (EGA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) constitutes a complementary strategy for more robustly evaluating the internal structure of the instrument. CFA allows predefined theoretical models to be tested through global fit and parsimony indices (Brown, 2015), whereas EGA empirically estimates dimensionality from networks of partial correlations without imposing a prior structure (Golino & Christensen, 2020). Thus, EGA exploratorily identifies the natural organization of the items and possible dimensional communities, while CFA confirms or contrasts that structure under specific theoretical assumptions.

Together, both methods allow for a more robust evaluation of the latent structure, reduce the risk of model misspecification, and broaden psychometric understanding beyond what traditional SEM offers on its own.

5. Although the authors clearly state the objective, I believe the manuscript would benefit from including explicit research hypotheses derived from theory and prior evidence.

Manuscript change

Therefore, it is both pertinent and necessary to have a scale that allows for the assessment of attitudes toward Indigenous people in Peru, taking into account the country's sociocultural particularities and the complexity of the phenomenon described. Unlike instruments developed in other contexts, the present study aims to examine the psychometric properties of the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale using rigorous and complementary analytical procedures, including confirmatory factor analysis, psychometric network models, and the assessment of differential item functioning, in order to provide solid evidence regarding its structure, functioning, and validity in the Peruvian population. In this regard, it is hypothesized that the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale will show adequate psychometric properties, including a valid internal structure, adequate levels of reliability, and measurement equivalence across sexes.

METHOD

Participants

6. The subheading for participants should be in English: "Participants."

Manuscript change

Participants

7. There is a small contradiction in the exclusion criteria: in "Participants," it states, "The exclusion criteria considered were: students over 18 years of age..." This is incorrect; the authors likely meant "inclusion." It should be corrected to: "The inclusion criteria were: students over 18 years of age..."

Manuscript change

The sample was non-probabilistic and selected by convenience, comprising 306 university students, 53.9% women and 46.1% men, age ($M = 20.18$, $SD = 2.3$). Sample size was determined using the calculator proposed by Arifin (2025) for structural equation models. The following parameters were considered: expected CFI = 0.95, average factor loading = 0.60, significance level (α) = 0.05, and statistical power = 0.80. For a two-dimensional, ten-item model (dimension 1: 7 items and dimension 2: 3 items) and an expected attrition rate of 10%, the minimum required sample size was $n = 293$. The inclusion criteria considered were: students over 18 years of age, enrolled at a private university in Arequipa, of both sexes.

Instrument

8. It is necessary to explain the instrument a bit further: how are the scores obtained for each factor interpreted?

Manuscript change

The instrument score is obtained by summing the items within each dimension. For both factors, higher values indicate more negative attitudes toward Indigenous people. The Contact and Stereotypes factor ranges from 7 to 35 points, while Intolerance and Inequity ranges from 3 to 15 points. Additionally, a total score can be calculated, ranging from 10 to 50 points.

9. It would be good to add sample items for each dimension.

Manuscript changes

In order to illustrate the content of the dimensions assessed, sample items are included. The Contact and Stereotypes factor includes items such as: "I would feel uncomfortable being seen in public with Indigenous people" and "I prefer not to shake hands with Indigenous people." The Intolerance and Inequity factor includes items such as: "Indigenous people are overly familiar" and "Indigenous people should not frequent certain places." These examples illustrate the type of attitudes assessed in each dimension.

10. The introduction does not mention, but should specify, the type of population in which the validation carried out by González-Fócil (2016) was conducted.

Manuscript changes

The scale was designed to be applied to students in health-related fields and to health professionals, the population in which its original validation was carried out (González-Fócil, 2016).

11. The authors indicate that an expert judge validation was conducted. What criteria did the judges use to evaluate the items? What scores did they provide? What profiles did the judges have to meet in order to be selected? This should be described in the procedure subsection.

Manuscript changes

...who analyzed each item according to three criteria: relevance, coherence, and clarity. For this purpose, a four-point ordinal scale was used, where 1 indicates that the item does not meet the criterion, 2 reflects a low level, 3 a moderate level, and 4 a high level of compliance. Judges were selected based on their experience and training in the field, including professionals in social psychology and sociology, which ensured a multidisciplinary evaluation of the instrument.

Data Analysis

12. Regarding the criteria considered for factorial equivalence, the authors have not highlighted the change criterion to be considered for the TLI; please review this.

Manuscript changes

$\Delta CFI < .01$ and $\Delta TLI < .01$, along with $\Delta RMSEA < .015$ and $\Delta SRMR < .030$ (Chen, 2007; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016).

13. The “DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT” section reads “Not applicable.” Although the data may not be made publicly available for confidentiality reasons, I recommend that the authors include a statement similar to the following: “The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.” Additionally, I believe it would be of great added value to include the R code used for the analyses as supplementary material. This would ensure full reproducibility of the study.

Manuscript changes

The data supporting the findings of the study are available from the corresponding author upon request, due to ethical and privacy restrictions. Additionally, the R code used for the analyses has been included as supplementary material to ensure the reproducibility of the study.

RESULTS

14. In the descriptive analysis of Table 2, it is mentioned that the variances show “absence of range restriction.” Although this is one indicator, it would be preferable to speak of “adequate dispersion” or directly of “sufficient variability,” since range restriction is better assessed by comparison with the theoretical scale (1–5).

Manuscript change

In Table 2, it is observed that all items show adequate variances ($\sigma > 1.15$), indicating appropriate dispersion and sufficient variability in responses. Skewness and kurtosis values fall within acceptable limits (< 1.5), indicating an approximately normal distribution of the data. Likewise, corrected item-total correlations ranged from .478 to .824, confirming adequate discrimination and internal consistency across all items. Additionally, the distribution of response categories shows that, across all items, the options Strongly Disagree (SD) and Disagree (D) predominate, indicating that no prejudiced attitudes toward Indigenous people are evident.

15. In Table 2, the third row uses σ to refer to the standard deviation, but the table note identifies it as “ σ^2 = variance.” Please correct this.

Manuscript changes

The note in Table 2 was revised to correctly indicate that σ corresponds to the standard deviation (SD), removing the reference to σ^2 as variance.

16. The paragraph on network invariance by sex states the following: “...networks for women (0) and men (1)...,” but in Figure 2 they are numbered 1 and 2. Please make the correction to identify which figure this corresponds to.

Manuscript changes

Figure 2 shows the comparison of the estimated networks for women (1) and men (2), evidencing a highly similar configuration of the relationships among items in both groups.

17. I find it notable that EGA shows 1 dimension while CFA more strongly supports a two-dimensional structure. Why do the authors not report the correlation between the factors? This discrepancy between EGA and CFA could indicate a high inter-factor correlation. The authors should explicitly explain the difference between community detection and factor modeling in the discussion. I also find it notable that in the network model, certain items show redundancy, specifically π_3 and π_4 , which show a moderate-to-high value. In the

confirmatory factor analysis, were modification indices not examined to identify possible significant covariances between items in the two-dimensional model?

Manuscript changes

Table 5

Items	Model 1		Model 2
	F1	F2	One-dimensional
pi_1	0.581		0.579
pi_2	0.725		0.722
pi_3	0.932		0.930
pi_4	0.908		0.907
pi_5	0.925		0.923
pi_6	0.910		0.907
pi_7	0.865		0.863
pi_8		0.667	0.641
pi_9		0.901	0.853
pi_10		0.814	0.779
Correlations			
F1: Contact and stereotypes			
F2: Intolerance and inequity	0.929		

Table 5 shows the factor loadings of the two-dimensional model (Model 1), which reveal moderate-to-high associations between the items and their respective factors ($\lambda = .581$ to $.932$ for F1 and $\lambda = .667$ to $.901$ for F2), supporting an adequate representation of the indicators within each dimension. However, the inter-factor correlation is very high ($r = .929$), suggesting substantial overlap between Contact and Stereotypes and Intolerance and Inequity, indicating limited discriminant validity and possible collinearity between factors. In this context, the one-dimensional model (Model 2) also shows moderate-to-high factor loadings ($\lambda = .579$ to $.930$), evidencing adequate saturation of all items on a single factor. Taken together, these results suggest that both factors may be reflecting a common underlying dimension; therefore, based on parsimony and conceptual coherence, the one-dimensional model is supported as the most adequate representation of the construct.

18. Since the confirmed factor model is not shown in any figure, it would be interesting for the authors to describe the factor loadings, at least the minimum and maximum values per factor.

Manuscript changes

This is provided in the figure above.

19. In the factorial invariance analysis, I believe it would be interesting to add the p-value between the nested models; although it is not a criterion to be considered and is affected by sample size, it does provide useful information.

Manuscript changes

This was indicated and added to the table.

$p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$.

DISCUSSION

20. I find it notable that the authors state that the scale shows no differences by sex, which I consider an overly categorical conclusion given the DIF detected. I believe the authors could instead state that “global invariance is confirmed, with a localized bias in certain items.”

Manuscript changes

The following was written: global invariance is confirmed, with a localized bias in certain items.

This finding indicates that items pi_2 and pi_3 do not exclusively measure attitudes toward Indigenous people, but partially capture normative components linked to gender, introducing systematic bias by sex. Nonetheless, given that measurement is globally invariant and DIF is restricted to two items, the instrument retains general validity for intergroup comparisons (Millsap, 2011; Zumbo, 1999). In this sense, all three approaches—multigroup SEM, psychometric networks, and IRT-based DIF—confirm that the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale shows global invariance, with a localized bias in certain items. Therefore, it is recommended that future studies explore semantically more neutral reformulations of these items, aimed at reducing the activation of social evaluation and

public visibility components, thereby strengthening the measurement equity of the instrument (Millsap, 2011; Zumbo, 1999).

21. I find it notable that in the discussion the authors focus on the presence of DIF but not on its magnitude: is it a small, moderate, or large DIF? Although the chi-square test is significant, it could be complemented with an effect size. This would help readers understand whether this detected bias, although real, is large enough to require immediate action or whether semantic refinement is sufficient. The authors could mention this as a limitation and suggest its analysis in future studies.

Comment to the reviewer

In the present study, the DIF analysis was based on likelihood ratio tests (χ^2), which allowed the presence of differential functioning to be identified. However, this approach does not directly provide an effect size estimate. According to the literature, the inclusion of indicators such as ΔR^2 or pseudo- R^2 allows the magnitude of DIF to be classified (small, moderate, or large), facilitating a more precise interpretation of its impact (Zumbo et al., 2003). It should be noted that only two items (pi_2 and pi_3) showed uniform DIF, and the observed χ^2 values were relatively low, suggesting that the effect may be of reduced magnitude. However, since an effect size was not directly estimated, this interpretation should be considered with caution.

Manuscript changes

Added to the Data Analysis section:

In this context, it is important to note that the assessment was based on likelihood ratio tests (χ^2), which allow the existence of bias to be detected but do not directly estimate its magnitude.

Added to the Limitations section:

Among the main limitations of the study is the use of a university sample, which restricts the generalizability of the results to other age groups and sociocultural contexts. Likewise, the cross-sectional design precludes establishing causal relationships between the attitudes assessed and possible associated variables. Although the scale showed global measurement equivalence by sex, the presence of localized DIF in two items suggests the need to continue refining the semantic content of certain items; additionally, it is suggested that future research consider effect size in order to more precisely assess the impact of DIF.

22. In the discussion of Figure 1 and the CFA results, it would be worthwhile to mention that, despite the preference for the two-dimensional model, the perfect structural stability found in bootEGA is a notable strength of the scale, as it indicates that the organization of the items around a central construct is highly replicable.

Manuscript changes

Regarding the internal structure of the instrument, the results obtained through psychometric networks and confirmatory analysis both point to a high degree of interrelation among all items. EGA suggested the grouping of items into a single stable community, which could initially be interpreted as a one-dimensional organization (Golino & Christensen, 2025; Christensen, 2020). CFA showed that the original two-dimensional model (M1), although it presents superior fit in terms of incremental indices and lower approximation error, also shows substantial overlap between factors, which limits its discriminant validity and suggests the presence of a common underlying dimension. In this regard, based on parsimony criteria, it was decided to reject the two-dimensional model and accept the one-dimensional model derived from the network analysis, which showed adequate factor loadings and satisfactory goodness-of-fit indices (Brown, 2015; Kline, 2015; Pavlov et al., 2021). Thus, there is convergence between the CFA and psychometric network results, as both approaches support the existence of a single latent dimension that explains the behavior of the items. This decision is based on the fact that, although the original dimensions capture distinct conceptual nuances, empirically they do not behave as independent constructs, but rather as manifestations of the same underlying attitudinal continuum toward Indigenous people.

23. Some important limitations are missing, such as social desirability bias, the self-report nature of the scale, the lack of reporting of the inter-factor correlation, and the failure to discuss the borderline RMSEA.

Manuscript changes

Among the main limitations of the study is the use of a university sample, which restricts the generalizability of the results to other age groups and sociocultural contexts. The possible presence of social desirability bias in the responses is also acknowledged, stemming from the sensitive nature of the content assessed, and the use of a self-report instrument may introduce biases associated with participants' subjective perceptions.

Likewise, the cross-sectional design precludes establishing causal relationships between the attitudes assessed and possible associated variables. Although the scale showed global measurement equivalence by sex, the presence of localized DIF in two items suggests the need to continue refining the semantic content of certain items; additionally, it is suggested that future research consider effect size in order to more precisely assess the impact of DIF. Furthermore, the borderline RMSEA value was not discussed in depth, which limits the interpretation of model fit in terms of approximation error.

Based on this, it is recommended that the validation of the instrument be replicated in more diverse samples, including non-university populations and intercultural contexts, and that semantically more neutral versions of the items with localized bias be explored. Future studies could also examine the relationship between attitudes toward Indigenous people and mental health, well-being, and social climate variables, thereby strengthening the use of the instrument in applied research and in the evaluation of interventions aimed at reducing prejudice.

REFERENCES

Please review the citation “Recasens, 2020,” as it is referenced as “Viola Recasens, A. (2020)...”

This was changed in the text.

24. Please review the following citation, “Ministerio de Cultura Perú, 2018,” as it is referenced as “Ministerio de cultura (Perú). (2018)...”

“Perú” was removed from the text.

25. Please review the following citation, “Indecopi, 2015,” as it appears to be referenced under a different author name. The only reference found is: Instituto Nacional de Defensa de la Competencia y de la Protección de la Propiedad Intelectual. (2015). Discriminación en el consumo y trato diferenciado ilícito en la jurisprudencia del Indecopi. Indecopi. <http://hdl.handle.net/11724/4973>

The inconsistency has been corrected by adding the acronym in brackets in the reference list entry, following APA 7th edition guidelines for institutional authors with widely recognized acronyms.

26. Please review the following citation, “CEPAL, 2016,” since, although it exists, the author name in the reference appears as: “CEPAL, Comisión Económica para América Latina (2016).”

The reference has been corrected.

27. Please review the following citation, “Rstudio Team, 2024,” since it is referenced as “R Core Team. (2024)...”

Corrected.

28. The citation “Merino-Soto and Livia-Segovia (2009)” is referenced differently: “Soto, C.M., & Segovia, J.L. (2009)...”

The correction was made by adding the second surnames in the reference.

29. The following reference appears twice: “Magis, D., Beland, S., Tuerlinckx, F., & De Boeck, P. (2010)...”

The duplicate reference was removed.

30. The following citation has no corresponding reference: “Vandenberg and Lance, 2000...”

The reference was added.

31. Please review the following citation, “WHO, 2008,” since it is referenced as “World Health Organization. (2008)...”

The reference and citation were corrected.

32. This reference is not cited: “Civalero, L., Alonso, D., & Brussino, S. (2019). Evaluación del prejuicio hacia inmigrantes: adaptación argentina de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto. Ciencias Psicológicas, 13(1), 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.22235/cp.v13i1.1814>”

The reference was removed.

Reviewer 2

Comments on wording and content:

1. In the participants section, the statement that the study sample was composed of 306 university students is repeated. It should be mentioned only once.

The repetition was removed.

2. Do not state in the same section that people who did not wish to participate were excluded. This is implicit, ethically appropriate, and is later indicated by stating that participation was voluntary.

The exclusion statement was removed.

3. When describing the procedure, it is sufficient to state that Google Forms was used; there is no need to include the link <https://forms.gle/uENWCKqNTiyv5yUE8>

The link was removed.

Manuscript changes

Following institutional authorization, the instrument was administered virtually via Google Forms within the university setting.

4. Statistical values should not be introduced in the Discussion section. The appropriate section for this information is the Results section.

The statistical values were removed.

5. Explicitly mention the non-probabilistic nature of the sample as a limitation, not only the fact that it was composed of university students.

Manuscript changes

Among the main limitations of the study is the use of a non-probabilistic, convenience-based university sample, which restricts the generalizability of the results to other age groups and sociocultural contexts. The possible presence of social desirability bias in the responses is also acknowledged, stemming from the sensitive nature of the content assessed, and the use of a self-report instrument may introduce biases associated with participants' subjective perceptions.

6. Another possible limitation concerns biases inherent to self-report measures, such as social desirability when responding to the instrument.

Manuscript changes

Among the main limitations of the study is the use of a non-probabilistic, convenience-based university sample, which restricts the generalizability of the results to other age groups and sociocultural contexts. The possible presence of social desirability bias in the responses is also acknowledged, stemming from the sensitive nature of the content assessed, and the use of a self-report instrument may introduce biases associated with participants' subjective perceptions.

Comments on APA style:

7. The abstract is unusually long, exceeding the 300-word limit recommended by the journal, and should therefore be shortened.

Short and precise abstract (282 words).

8. Subsections in the Data Analysis section should not be numbered, nor should subsections in the Results section. The heading level guidelines specified in the APA manual should be followed.

The numbering was removed from the Data Analysis and Results sections.

9. Table 6 should be presented and cited in the text.

Table numbering has been updated accordingly: the former Table 6 now corresponds to Table 7 due to the addition of an extra table.

10. In citations, do not use the form "et al."; use only "et al."

This was done.

11. I did not find citations associated with the following references; please verify:

- Civalero, L., Alonso, D., & Brussino, S. (2019): this reference was removed
- Viola Recasens, A. (2020): surname corrected
- Pedersen et al. (2011): this citation was removed
- Soto, C.M., & Segovia, J.L. (2009): surname corrected.

12. I did not find references associated with the following citations; please verify:

- Merino-Soto and Livia-Segovia (2009) → In the reference list this appears as Soto, C.M., & Segovia, J.L. (2009). Corrected in both the citation and the reference.
- Recasens (2020): surname corrected.
- Vandenberg & Lance (2000): reference added.

13. The reference must correspond exactly to what is indicated in the citation. Please review: Posit Team (2023). Corrected.

Additionally, if surnames are hyphenated, they must appear the same way in both citations and references. This was corrected.

14. In the Alcota et al. (2025) reference, "DOI:" should not be included; instead, it should be presented directly in the format <https://doi.org/xxx>.

Corrected according to the instruction.

Huamani-Cahua, J. C., Ordoño Ticona, Y., Viamonte Quispe, M. Y., Vega Carpio, N. B., & Ojeda-Flores, E. C. (2026). Psychometric properties of the Attitudes toward Indigenous People Scale in Peruvian university students: Evidence from factorial analysis, psychometric network modeling, and differential item functioning. *Interacciones*, 12, e514. <https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.514>

Please also correct the format in: Viola Recasens, A. (2020). This was corrected.

15. In the Brown (2015) reference, the place of publication (New York, NY) should not be included, per current guidelines.

The place of publication was removed.

The same applies to CEPAL (2016).

16. In the Cárdenas (2007) reference, prioritize the retrieval link from the journal itself rather than other links: <https://revistas.javeriana.edu.co/index.php/revPsycho/article/view/114>

This was changed.

17. The structure of the following references is incorrect; please review the APA manual:

Christensen, A.P. (2020): the reference was changed.

González Fócil, R.C. (2016): the reference was changed.

18. A shorter link (optional) can be used for “de Veintimilla, A.M. (2024)”: <https://caapecuador.org/ecuador-debate-n-121/>

This was replaced with the indicated link.

19. In the reference for Soto, C.M., & Segovia, J.L. (2009), the title appears in English in brackets. Please decide whether this practice will be applied consistently when presenting references originally published in Spanish. Comment to the reviewer

The inclusion of the English title in brackets in the Merino Soto and Livia Segovia (2009) reference is not an error but a valid practice under APA 7th edition for articles published with a parallel title in another language. In this particular case, the journal *Anales de Psicología* publishes articles bilingually (Spanish and English), so the English title is an official part of the publication; however, if the reviewers still prefer the change, it will be made.

20. The Magis et al. reference appears twice; please correct this duplication.

The duplicate was removed.