Saul-Callacondo, V., Abigail-Marca, L., Antonio-Ccotohuanca, J., Lidia-Zela, J., Briones-Llamoctanta, B. (2026). Development and Psychometric Validation of a Scale Measuring Stigma Toward People with Disabilities in the Adult Population. *Interacciones, 12*, e557. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.557

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

Relevance: Very high
Novelty: High
Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:
The study provides a novel multidimensional measurement tool adapted to the Peruvian cultural context. Furthermore, it employs robust contemporary statistical techniques for ordinal data, such as polychoric correlations and the Weighted Least Squares Mean and Variance adjusted (WLSMV) estimator.
The following are detailed observations and recommendations to improve the methodological and presentation quality of the manuscript:

RA.1 — Reviewer comment
Sample Representativeness (Participants section): It is stated that the instrument was designed for the "adult population." However, Table 1 and the demographic analysis indicate that 53.1% of the participants are between 18 and 22 years old. It is recommended to nuance the conclusions by stating that the validation relies primarily on a sample of young adults, or to provide a justification as to why this age distribution is representative of the general population in Juliaca.

RA.2 — Reviewer comment
Methodological Circularity (Method/Analysis Plan section): The study sequentially applies an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). It is not specified whether the total sample of 1,065 participants was randomly split to perform both analyses. Conducting a CFA on the exact same data used to explore the structure in the EFA constitutes a methodological circularity that overestimates the goodness-of-fit indices. If the sample was not split, it is strongly requested that the authors perform a cross-validation (e.g., allocating 500 cases to the EFA and 565 to the CFA) and report the newly estimated fit indices.

RA.3 — Reviewer comment
Item Communality (Table 3, Re-specified model): Item X13 is retained in the model despite showing a very low communality (h^2) of 0.27. Given that the authors removed items X5, X10, and X20 citing inadequate factorial performance, a rigorous theoretical or statistical justification explaining why item X13 was conserved is requested.

RA.4 — Reviewer comment
Missing Figures (Content Validity Analysis section): The text refers to "Figure 1" to display the lower bounds of the confidence intervals. However, this figure is absent from the document; the manuscript skips directly to the presentation of Table 2. The missing figure must be included, or the reference within the text must be corrected.

RA.5 — Reviewer comment
Plot Legibility (Results section): The images corresponding to the factor structure ("Figure 2. Semplot of Model 1" and "Path diagram of Model 2") present severe legibility issues. There is overlapping text in the residual variances and factor loadings, as well as low overall image sharpness. It is recommended to regenerate the plots in the statistical software, adjusting the graphical layout so that all parameter estimates are clearly visible.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High
Novelty: High
Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:
The manuscript addresses a relevant topic for research in psychology, education, and disability studies by proposing the development of an instrument to assess stigma toward people with disabilities in the adult population. Among its main strengths are the relevance of the research problem, the incorporation of a well-established theoretical framework, the use of complementary psychometric procedures to examine content validity, factorial structure, and internal consistency, as well as the sample size and the reporting of several statistical indicators. The study also has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the assessment of attitudes toward people with disabilities in the Peruvian context.
Nevertheless, before the manuscript can be considered for publication, several issues should be addressed regarding the theoretical foundation, the review of previous research and existing instruments, the justification of methodological decisions, the consistency of the psychometric analyses, and the articulation between the results and the discussion.

RB.1 — Reviewer comment
Expand the literature review on stigma toward people with disabilities by incorporating a more comprehensive discussion of the main theoretical and empirical contributions related to this construct.

RB.2 — Reviewer comment
Provide a clearer explanation of Goffman's theory, which serves as the theoretical foundation of the study, and specify how its main propositions relate to the conceptualization of stigma toward people with disabilities adopted in the manuscript.

RB.3 — Reviewer comment
Present and discuss previously developed instruments designed to assess stigma toward people with disabilities, as well as, where appropriate, related instruments developed in other contexts. Their main characteristics, dimensions, contributions, and limitations should be described in order to provide a stronger justification for the development of a new instrument.

RB.4 — Reviewer comment
Clarify whether instruments specifically assessing stigma toward people with disabilities have previously been validated in Peru. If such instruments exist, they should be incorporated into and discussed in the literature review. If no instruments with these characteristics were identified, this should be explicitly stated and supported by a sufficiently comprehensive literature search.

RB.5 — Reviewer comment
Provide a stronger theoretical justification for the four proposed dimensions of the instrument. The authors should explain which conceptual and empirical antecedents informed the definition of these dimensions and the allocation of individual items to each dimension.

RB.6 — Reviewer comment
Expand the review of methodological references used to support the decisions made during the development and psychometric evaluation of the instrument, particularly regarding exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, content validity, and reliability estimation.

RB.7 — Reviewer comment
Clearly specify the criteria used to determine the adequacy of the statistical indices and cut-off values employed throughout the analyses and provide the corresponding methodological references.

RB.8 — Reviewer comment
Provide a more detailed description of the content validity procedure, including the rationale for the criteria used to interpret Aiken's V coefficients and their confidence intervals.

RB.9 — Reviewer comment
Describe the characteristics of the expert judges who participated in the content evaluation and specify the criteria used for their selection.

RB.10 — Reviewer comment
Include a reference to the ethical code, guideline, or regulatory framework followed in conducting the study and briefly explain how its relevant ethical principles were addressed.
RB.11 — Reviewer comment
Clearly specify the software used for each statistical analysis. In particular, clarify whether all analyses were conducted using R/RStudio or whether additional statistical software was employed.
RB.12 — Reviewer comment
Add a subheading that clearly distinguishes the presentation of participants' sociodemographic characteristics from the section reporting descriptive statistics for the individual items.
RB.13 — Reviewer comment
Provide methodological references supporting the statements regarding acceptable levels of item skewness, kurtosis, and discrimination.
RB.14 — Reviewer comment
Review the presentation of Table 1 and remove formatting elements that do not correspond to the final editorial version, including the underlining identified in Table 2.
RB.15 — Reviewer comment
Reconsider the interpretation of communalities in the exploratory factor analysis. Communality criteria should be presented and interpreted before discussing factor loadings. The authors should also clearly explain the criteria used to determine whether items were retained or removed.
RB.16 — Reviewer comment
Explain the specific theoretical considerations that, in addition to the statistical criteria, led to the removal of items X5, X10, and X20.
RB.17 — Reviewer comment
Review Table 3 and remove items with factor loadings below the stated retention criterion, unless there is a clear theoretical justification for retaining them. Any such exceptions should be explicitly explained.
RB.18 — Reviewer comment
Clearly identify which items correspond to each of the four factors in both the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.
RB.19 — Reviewer comment
Carefully review the correspondence between the factorial structure presented in Table 3 and the structure shown in Figure 2. There are currently inconsistencies in the allocation of several items to the factors, particularly items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, as well as items 1–5. These discrepancies should be resolved before the proposed factorial structure can be considered established.
RB.20 — Reviewer comment
Explain why MINRES was selected as the extraction method for the exploratory factor analysis and why WLSMV was used as the estimator for the confirmatory factor analysis. The manuscript should clearly distinguish the function and rationale of these two procedures.
RB.21 — Reviewer comment
Specify precisely which items were removed during model respecification and distinguish between the statistical criteria and the theoretical considerations underlying each removal decision.
RB.22 — Reviewer comment
Include methodological references supporting the cut-off criteria used to interpret CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR.
RB.23 — Reviewer comment
Provide methodological support for the statement that an RMSEA value of .086 may be considered acceptable under the specific conditions of the estimated model. This interpretation should not be presented as a general criterion applicable across all models.
RB.24 — Reviewer comment
Revise the figure representing the factorial model. Although the current representation is visually appealing, it should be replaced by a figure created directly by the authors and provided in an editable format in accordance with editorial requirements.
RB.25 — Reviewer comment
Present the reliability results in a table that allows for clearer comparison of the coefficients obtained for each dimension and reduces excessive repetition in the narrative text.

RB.26 — Reviewer comment
Revise the Discussion section so that it does not primarily repeat the results already presented. The discussion should instead interpret the main findings, compare them with previous studies, explain their implications, and address their scope and limitations.

RB.27 — Reviewer comment
Avoid using content validity evidence reported for instruments developed by other authors as evidence supporting the content validity of the newly developed instrument. Such psychometric evidence pertains to different instruments and cannot directly substantiate the validity of the present measure.

RB.28 — Reviewer comment
Move to the literature review those studies that are currently discussed in the Discussion section but primarily serve an introductory or contextualizing function.

RB.29 — Reviewer comment
Strengthen the discussion of the implications of the identified factorial structure and explain how the four factors relate to the theoretical conceptualization of stigma presented at the beginning of the manuscript.

RB.30 — Reviewer comment
Review the coherence among the theoretical framework, the obtained factorial structure, and the labels assigned to the four dimensions, particularly in light of the current inconsistencies between the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.

RB.31 — Reviewer comment
Conduct a comprehensive review of the consistency across all sections of the manuscript. There are discrepancies in some reported values, methodological criteria, and descriptions of the results that should be corrected to ensure both methodological and editorial consistency.

RB.32 — Reviewer comment
Strengthen the discussion of the study limitations, particularly those associated with the non-probability sampling strategy, the predominance of younger participants, and the recruitment of participants from a single city. These limitations should be explicitly considered when discussing the generalizability of the findings.

RB.33 — Reviewer comment
Conduct a thorough editorial review of the manuscript to correct issues related to writing, formatting, references, table and figure numbering, and other elements that currently appear to derive from a working or preliminary version of the document.

RB.34 — Reviewer comment
The annotated manuscript accompanying this review contains additional specific corrections and comments throughout the text. These annotations are provided to facilitate the authors' revision and the preparation of a substantially improved version of the manuscript.

Saul-Callacondo, V., Abigail-Marca, L., Antonio-Ccotohuanca, J., Lidia-Zela, J., Briones-Llamoctanta, B. (2026). Development and Psychometric Validation of a Scale Measuring Stigma Toward People with Disabilities in the Adult Population. *Interacciones, 12*, e557. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.557

RESPONSE LETTER

Title: Development and Psychometric Validation of a Scale Measuring Stigma Toward People with Disabilities in the Adult Population
Journal: Interacciones

Dear Editor and Reviewers,
We sincerely thank the Editor and both reviewers for their careful and constructive evaluation of our manuscript. We have substantially revised the manuscript while preserving the original study aims. The main revisions include expansion and clarification of the theoretical framework; separation of the sample into mutually exclusive exploratory and confirmatory subsamples; re-estimation of all factor analyses; clarification of item-retention decisions; improved reporting of content validity, reliability, factor differentiation, and measurement invariance; revision of tables and figures; and substantial reduction and restructuring of the Discussion. All changes have been highlighted in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer A

RA.1 — Reviewer comment: Sample Representativeness (Participants section): It is stated that the instrument was designed for the "adult population." However, Table 1 and the demographic analysis indicate that 53.1% of the participants are between 18 and 22 years old. It is recommended to nuance the conclusions by stating that the validation relies primarily on a sample of young adults, or to provide a justification as to why this age distribution is representative of the general population in Juliaca.
Response: Addressed. We now explicitly describe the convenience sampling strategy, report that 53.1% of participants were aged 18–22 years, and clarify that the sample should not be considered nationally representative. The conclusions and limitations were correspondingly tempered.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Participants; Results—Sample characteristics; Discussion—Strengths and limitations; Conclusion.
RA.2 — Reviewer comment: Methodological Circularity (Method/Analysis Plan section): The study sequentially applies an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). It is not specified whether the total sample of 1,065 participants was randomly split to perform both analyses. Conducting a CFA on the exact same data used to explore the structure in the EFA constitutes a methodological circularity that overestimates the goodness-of-fit indices. If the sample was not split, it is strongly requested that the authors perform a cross-validation (e.g., allocating 500 cases to the EFA and 565 to the CFA) and report the newly estimated fit indices.
Response: Addressed through complete reanalysis. The total sample was divided into mutually exclusive development (n = 533) and confirmatory (n = 532) subsamples. EFA was conducted exclusively in the development sample and CFA exclusively in the confirmatory sample. The split procedure and its deterministic nature are now explicitly reported.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Study design and Data partitioning; Results—Sample characteristics and CFA.
RA.3 — Reviewer comment: Item Communality (Table 3, Re-specified model): Item X13 is retained in the model despite showing a very low communality (h^2) of 0.27. Given that the authors removed items X5, X10, and X20 citing inadequate factorial performance, a rigorous theoretical or statistical justification explaining why item X13 was conserved is requested.
Response: Addressed. The split-sample reanalysis replaced the previous estimate. In the revised EFA, X13 showed h^2 = .474 rather than .27. Communalities are now considered before factor loadings, and retention decisions integrate statistical and conceptual evidence.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Exploratory factor analysis; Results—Four-factor exploratory structure, Table 2.
RA.4 — Reviewer comment: Missing Figures (Content Validity Analysis section): The text refers to "Figure 1" to display the lower bounds of the confidence intervals. However, this figure is absent from the document; the manuscript skips directly to the presentation of Table 2. The missing figure must be included, or the reference within the text must be corrected.
Response: Addressed by removing the obsolete figure reference and reporting the Aiken's V estimates and 95% confidence intervals directly in the Results and Supplementary Material.
Location in revised manuscript: Results—Content validity.
RA.5 — Reviewer comment: Plot Legibility (Results section): The images corresponding to the factor structure ("Figure 2. Semplot of Model 1" and "Path diagram of Model 2") present severe legibility issues. There is

overlapping text in the residual variances and factor loadings, as well as low overall image sharpness. It is recommended to regenerate the plots in the statistical software, adjusting the graphical layout so that all parameter estimates are clearly visible.
Response: Addressed. The previous low-resolution diagrams were removed. The revised manuscript uses a simplified presentation of the factor structure.

Reviewer B

RB.1 — Reviewer comment: Expand the literature review on stigma toward people with disabilities by incorporating a more comprehensive discussion of the main theoretical and empirical contributions related to this construct.
Response: Addressed. The Introduction was substantially revised to incorporate theoretical and empirical literature on stigma, disability stigma, participation, and rehabilitation.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction, paragraphs 1–6.
RB.2 — Reviewer comment: Provide a clearer explanation of Goffman's theory, which serves as the theoretical foundation of the study, and specify how its main propositions relate to the conceptualization of stigma toward people with disabilities adopted in the manuscript.
Response: Addressed. We now distinguish Goffman's historical conceptualization from subsequent stigma frameworks and clarify that the four initial content domains were not dimensions directly proposed by Goffman.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction, paragraphs 3–4 and final paragraph; Discussion—Interpretation of the empirical structure.
RB.3 — Reviewer comment: Present and discuss previously developed instruments designed to assess stigma toward people with disabilities, as well as, where appropriate, related instruments developed in other contexts. Their main characteristics, dimensions, contributions, and limitations should be described in order to provide a stronger justification for the development of a new instrument.
Response: Addressed. The Introduction now reviews the ADS, multidimensional disability-attitude measures, recent disability measures, and their conceptual differences from public disability stigma.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction, paragraphs 5–6.
RB.4 — Reviewer comment: Clarify whether instruments specifically assessing stigma toward people with disabilities have previously been validated in Peru. If such instruments exist, they should be incorporated into and discussed in the literature review. If no instruments with these characteristics were identified, this should be explicitly stated and supported by a sufficiently comprehensive literature search.
Response: Addressed. The Peruvian SAPD is now explicitly discussed, including its attitudinal focus and its conceptual distinction from the present public-stigma measure.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction, penultimate paragraph; Discussion—Item performance and reliability.
RB.5 — Reviewer comment: Provide a stronger theoretical justification for the four proposed dimensions of the instrument. The authors should explain which conceptual and empirical antecedents informed the definition of these dimensions and the allocation of individual items to each dimension.
Response: Addressed. The domains are now presented as deductive content domains for item generation informed by stigma, disability, participation, autonomy, and capability literature, rather than as established latent dimensions.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction, final paragraph; Methods—Instrument development.
RB.6 — Reviewer comment: Expand the review of methodological references used to support the decisions made during the development and psychometric evaluation of the instrument, particularly regarding exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, content validity, and reliability estimation.
Response: Addressed. Additional methodological support was incorporated for scale development, sample adequacy, ordinal parallel analysis, CFA with ordinal indicators, reliability, HTMT, and invariance.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Statistical analysis.
RB.7 — Reviewer comment: Clearly specify the criteria used to determine the adequacy of the statistical indices and cut-off values employed throughout the analyses and provide the corresponding methodological references.
Response: Addressed. Fit-index values are now described as reference values rather than rigid pass/fail thresholds, with appropriate methodological citations.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Confirmatory factor analysis.

RB.8 — Reviewer comment: Provide a more detailed description of the content validity procedure, including the rationale for the criteria used to interpret Aiken's V coefficients and their confidence intervals.
Response: Addressed. The revised manuscript describes the evaluated criteria, use of Aiken's V and 95% CIs, and the joint statistical and qualitative basis for item decisions.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Content validity; Results—Content validity.
RB.9 — Reviewer comment: Describe the characteristics of the expert judges who participated in the content evaluation and specify the criteria used for their selection.
Response: Addressed. The manuscript now reports that six judges were purposively selected based on postgraduate training and professional expertise in relevant psychological, disability, and educational fields.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Content validity.
RB.10 — Reviewer comment: Include a reference to the ethical code, guideline, or regulatory framework followed in conducting the study and briefly explain how its relevant ethical principles were addressed.
Response: Addressed. Ethical approval, informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and the institutional Code of Ethics for Research are now explicitly reported.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Procedure and ethical considerations.
RB.11 — Reviewer comment: Clearly specify the software used for each statistical analysis. In particular, clarify whether all analyses were conducted using R/RStudio or whether additional statistical software was employed.
Response: Addressed. All analyses were conducted in R 4.5.3 using RStudio; the main packages and their analytical functions are explicitly reported. No additional statistical software was used.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Statistical software and reproducibility.
RB.12 — Reviewer comment: Add a subheading that clearly distinguishes the presentation of participants' sociodemographic characteristics from the section reporting descriptive statistics for the individual items.
Response: Addressed through separate subsections.
Location in revised manuscript: Results—Sample characteristics; Item-level descriptive statistics.
RB.13 — Reviewer comment: Provide methodological references supporting the statements regarding acceptable levels of item skewness, kurtosis, and discrimination.
Response: Addressed by removing mechanical "acceptable/not acceptable" cutoff claims. Skewness and kurtosis are now reported descriptively rather than used as normality criteria.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Item-level analyses; Results—Item-level descriptive statistics.
RB.14 — Reviewer comment: Review the presentation of Table 1 and remove formatting elements that do not correspond to the final editorial version, including the underlining identified in Table 2.
Response: Addressed. Underlining and working-version formatting were removed, tables were renumbered, and the presentation was standardized.
Location in revised manuscript: All revised tables.
RB.15 — Reviewer comment: Reconsider the interpretation of communalities in the exploratory factor analysis. Communality criteria should be presented and interpreted before discussing factor loadings. The authors should also clearly explain the criteria used to determine whether items were retained or removed.
Response: Addressed. Communalities and factorial complexity are now examined before interpretation of factor loadings, and item decisions are based jointly on psychometric and conceptual evidence.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—EFA; Results—Four-factor exploratory structure.
RB.16 — Reviewer comment: Explain the specific theoretical considerations that, in addition to the statistical criteria, led to the removal of items X5, X10, and X20.
Response: The revised split-sample analysis changed the previous model-development decision. The primary revised model no longer deletes X5, X10, or X20; all 20 items are retained. X20 is examined separately through sensitivity analysis because it showed the weakest loading.
Location in revised manuscript: Results—Sensitivity analysis for X20; Discussion—Item performance.
RB.17 — Reviewer comment: Review Table 3 and remove items with factor loadings below the stated retention criterion, unless there is a clear theoretical justification for retaining them. Any such exceptions should be explicitly explained.
Response: Addressed. Coefficients with $|\lambda| < .30$ are suppressed in the main EFA table for readability, while the complete matrix is retained in the Supplementary Material. Relevant cross-loadings are explicitly discussed.
Location in revised manuscript: Results, Table 2 and Supplementary Material.
RB.18 — Reviewer comment: Clearly identify which items correspond to each of the four factors in both the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.
Response: Addressed explicitly: EF1 = X11, X14–X19; EF2 = X6–X9, X12; EF3 = X1–X4; EF4 = X5, X10, X13, X20.

Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Competing models; Results—Four-factor exploratory structure.
RB.19 — Reviewer comment: Carefully review the correspondence between the factorial structure presented in Table 3 and the structure shown in Figure 2. There are currently inconsistencies in the allocation of several items to the factors, particularly items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, as well as items 1–5. These discrepancies should be resolved before the proposed factorial structure can be considered established.
Response: Addressed. Factor labels were standardized throughout the manuscript as EF1 = MR1, EF2 = MR4, EF3 = MR3, and EF4 = MR2, and the previous inconsistent graphical representation was removed/revised.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods, Results, tables, and Supplementary Material.
RB.20 — Reviewer comment: Explain why MINRES was selected as the extraction method for the exploratory factor analysis and why WLSMV was used as the estimator for the confirmatory factor analysis. The manuscript should clearly distinguish the function and rationale of these two procedures.
Response: Addressed. MINRES is now described as the extraction method used with the polychoric matrix in EFA, whereas WLSMV is justified separately as the estimator for CFA with ordered categorical indicators.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—EFA and CFA.
RB.21 — Reviewer comment: Specify precisely which items were removed during model respecification and distinguish between the statistical criteria and the theoretical considerations underlying each removal decision.
Response: Addressed by reanalyzing the scale using independent development and confirmatory samples. The previous 17-item post hoc solution was not retained as the primary model; the revised primary model includes all 20 items, with X20 assessed through a transparent sensitivity analysis.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Sensitivity analyses; Results—Sensitivity analysis for X20.
RB.22 — Reviewer comment: Include methodological references supporting the cut-off criteria used to interpret CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR.
Response: Addressed with Hu and Bentler (1999) and recent methodological work emphasizing context-sensitive interpretation.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods—Confirmatory factor analysis.
RB.23 — Reviewer comment: Provide methodological support for the statement that an RMSEA value of .086 may be considered acceptable under the specific conditions of the estimated model. This interpretation should not be presented as a general criterion applicable across all models.
Response: Addressed. The previous claim that RMSEA = .086 represented generally acceptable fit was removed. The revised manuscript describes the selected model as showing mixed absolute fit and reports RMSEA together with its confidence interval.
Location in revised manuscript: Results—CFA; Discussion—Confirmatory evidence.
RB.24 — Reviewer comment: Revise the figure representing the factorial model. Although the current representation is visually appealing, it should be replaced by a figure created directly by the authors and provided in an editable format in accordance with editorial requirements.
Response: The previous non-editable figures were removed. The revised factor structure is reported clearly in tables and the Supplementary Material.
Location in revised manuscript: Results and Supplementary Material.
RB.25 — Reviewer comment: Present the reliability results in a table that allows for clearer comparison of the coefficients obtained for each dimension and reduces excessive repetition in the narrative text.
Response: Addressed. Cronbach's α, ordinal α, McDonald's ω, AVE, and composite reliability are now reported together in a concise table, with HTMT presented in the same section.
Location in revised manuscript: Results—Reliability and within-model construct evidence, Table 4.
RB.26 — Reviewer comment: Revise the Discussion section so that it does not primarily repeat the results already presented. The discussion should instead interpret the main findings, compare them with previous studies, explain their implications, and address their scope and limitations.
Response: Addressed. The Discussion was substantially shortened and reorganized to emphasize interpretation, comparison with previous studies, theoretical implications, limitations, and future research rather than repeating numerical results.
Location in revised manuscript: Entire revised Discussion.
RB.27 — Reviewer comment: Avoid using content validity evidence reported for instruments developed by other authors as evidence supporting the content validity of the newly developed instrument. Such

psychometric evidence pertains to different instruments and cannot directly substantiate the validity of the present measure.
Response: Addressed. Previous scales are now discussed only as contextual and comparative evidence. Their psychometric properties are not presented as validation evidence for the present instrument.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction and Discussion.
RB.28 — Reviewer comment: Move to the literature review those studies that are currently discussed in the Discussion section but primarily serve an introductory or contextualizing function.
Response: Addressed. Literature primarily serving theoretical or contextual purposes was relocated to the Introduction, while the Discussion retains only comparisons directly relevant to interpretation of the findings.
Location in revised manuscript: Introduction and Discussion.
RB.29 — Reviewer comment: Strengthen the discussion of the implications of the identified factorial structure and explain how the four factors relate to the theoretical conceptualization of stigma presented at the beginning of the manuscript.
Response: Addressed. The Discussion now interprets the empirical factors in relation to public disability stigma, functional competence judgments, participation, and the possible wording-related nature of EF4.
Location in revised manuscript: Discussion—Interpretation of the empirical structure.
RB.30 — Reviewer comment: Review the coherence among the theoretical framework, the obtained factorial structure, and the labels assigned to the four dimensions, particularly in light of the current inconsistencies between the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.
Response: Addressed. The original theoretical domains are clearly distinguished from the empirical factors, which are conservatively labeled EF1–EF4 to avoid assigning unsupported substantive labels.
Location in revised manuscript: Methods, Results, and Discussion.
RB.31 — Reviewer comment: Conduct a comprehensive review of the consistency across all sections of the manuscript. There are discrepancies in some reported values, methodological criteria, and descriptions of the results that should be corrected to ensure both methodological and editorial consistency.
Response: Addressed through a complete consistency review. Sample sizes, factor allocations, fit indices, item-retention decisions, terminology, and conclusions were harmonized throughout the manuscript.
Location in revised manuscript: Entire revised manuscript.
RB.32 — Reviewer comment: Strengthen the discussion of the study limitations, particularly those associated with the non-probability sampling strategy, the predominance of younger participants, and the recruitment of participants from a single city. These limitations should be explicitly considered when discussing the generalizability of the findings.
Response: Addressed. The revised Discussion explicitly covers non-probability sampling, the predominance of younger adults, single-city recruitment, deterministic sample partitioning, mixed structural evidence, response-format limitations, absence of external measures, and lack of participatory co-design.
Location in revised manuscript: Discussion—Strengths and limitations.
RB.33 — Reviewer comment: Conduct a thorough editorial review of the manuscript to correct issues related to writing, formatting, references, table and figure numbering, and other elements that currently appear to derive from a working or preliminary version of the document.
Response: Addressed. The manuscript was edited for clarity and concision; references were standardized; tables and figures were renumbered; obsolete material was removed; and terminology was harmonized across sections.
Location in revised manuscript: Entire manuscript.
RB.34 — Reviewer comment: The annotated manuscript accompanying this review contains additional specific corrections and comments throughout the text. These annotations are provided to facilitate the authors' revision and the preparation of a substantially improved version of the manuscript.
Response: Addressed. The annotations in the reviewed manuscript were examined individually and incorporated into the revisions described above, including methodological justification, item allocation, content-validity reporting, factor interpretation, and editorial corrections.
We again thank the Editor and Reviewers for their detailed comments. We believe that the revised manuscript is substantially clearer, methodologically stronger, and more appropriately cautious regarding the scope of the psychometric evidence.

Sincerely,
The Authors