

# **Network analysis applied to DASS-21: Emergence of a new dimension**

Marco Antônio Silva Alvarenga <sup>1¶#a</sup>, Paulo Felipe Ribeiro Bandeira <sup>2,3¶</sup>, Carolina Souza Guilhermino <sup>1&</sup>, Tiago Geraldo de Azevedo <sup>1&</sup>, Kelly Fernandes Olímpio <sup>1&</sup>, Camila Kersul <sup>1&</sup>, Glacithane Lins da Cunha <sup>3&</sup>, Juliana Alves-Teodoro <sup>4¶</sup>, Pricila Cristina Correa Ribeiro <sup>5¶</sup>, Marcela Mansur-Alves <sup>5¶</sup>, Maycoln Lêoni Martins Teodoro <sup>5¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Departamento de Psicologia. Universidade Federal de São João del-Rei (UFSJ), São João del-Rei, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia (UFSJ)

<sup>2</sup> Departamento de Educação Física, Universidade Regional do Cariri, Crato, Ceará, Brazil

<sup>3</sup> Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação Física, Universidade Federal do Vale do São Francisco (UNIVASF), Petrolina, Pernambuco, Brazil

<sup>4</sup> Departamento de Farmácia Social, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil

<sup>4</sup> Departamento de Psicologia, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Programa de Pós-Graduação Cognição e Comportamento (UFMG)

\* Corresponding author

E-mail: [alvarenga@ufs.ju.br](mailto:alvarenga@ufs.ju.br)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

& These authors also contributed equally to this work

#a Current Address: Department of Psychology. Federal University of Sao Joao del-Rei (UFSJ). Praça Dom Helvecio, 74, 2.12B, Dom Bosco, São João del-Rei, Minas Gerais, Brazil

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## **Abstract**

The DASS-21 has been studied in different samples and cultures as a brief tool for screening and referral to specialized interventions, thus presenting the prerogative to be characterized as a complex system (CS). CS is a new approach to data analysis assumes that items on a scale are components integrated as a network. Despite this, to date network analysis has not been applied to verify the psychometric properties of the DASS-21. This was a non-clinical sample consisting of college students and professionals (N = 4017), aged 18 years or older (M = 31.16; SD = 10.308), from different Brazilian regions. The data collection was done through electronic forms composed by a sociodemographic questionnaire and DASS-21. Participants could forward the form to other potential respondents. Uni, bi, and multivariate analyses were used, and, among them, exploratory graph analysis (EGA) and bootstrap EGA (BootEGA). EGA e BootEGA generated a model with four factors. The four-factor model from DASS-21 showed better fit rates compared to the others replicated in this research. The new four factor model has excellent composite reliability and is invariant regard to gender and type of activity performed. This research was composed of a non-probabilistic and convenience sample, without equitable geographical distribution of the participants and whose answers to this study were provided only by the web-based forms. The DASS-21 presented a new factor model composed of four distinct dimensions with excellent intrinsic features.

## **1. Introduction**

The short form of the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21) is a widely used self-report instrument to assess affective-emotional changes related to mood and anxiety [1-3]. This version presents a model with good discrimination among symptoms related

to depression, anxiety and stress in clinical and non-clinical samples [4-6] comprised of adolescents [7,8] college students [9,10] healthcare professionals [11] psychoactive substance users [12] and athletes [13]. The depression subscale features items related to moodiness, hopelessness and lack of motivation; the anxiety subscale reports response promptness and physical changes; and the stress subscale refers to persistent tension, irritability and a poor tolerance for frustration [14].

As of the time of writing this article, DASS-21 has been adapted for at least 55 different linguistic-cultural contexts across all continents [15]. There is research on this scale in Oceania [16], Africa [17-19], America [14, 20-24] and Eurasia [25-36]. Thus, DASS-21 has become a widely used instrument to assess the severity of burden and affective changes. Despite the consistency of the results found in the investigations carried out, there is divergence about the dimensional structure of this instrument.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) have been the methods most used to verify the psychometric properties of the scale [2], often indicating a three-factor model. However, other models for DASS-21 have been reported from such analyses. Henry and Crawford [5], for example, have shown a model expressed by three factors (represented by items from the depression, anxiety and stress subscales) and also by a single factor (general psychological distress), calling it a bifactor model. Uni- and bidimensional models are also described in the literature: some items from the depression and anxiety subscales are taken to form just one dimension [37] the depression and anxiety subscales are classed as one dimension and the stress subscale as another [38] the depression and stress subscales are classed as one dimension and the anxiety subscale as another [23]; the anxiety and stress subscales are

classed as one dimension and the depression subscale as another [39,40] and a bidimensional model expressed by two dimensions distinguished from those previously mentioned – physiological arousal and generalized negativity [41].

Some recent studies have employed other methods for analyzing DASS-21, namely the exploratory structural equation model (ESEM: [16, 42] and the bifactor ESEM (BESEM: [2]. ESEM has the advantage of combining EFA and CFA in such a way that the dimensions described are not related to each other [43]. Using ESEM, both Johnson et al. [16] and Kyriazos et al. [42] evidenced a three-dimensional model for DASS-21 versions with different numbers of items. BESEM makes it possible to combine two simultaneous analysis methods for a bifactor approach [44]. However, Gomez et al. [2]. demonstrated that a general factor model was more satisfactory when they applied this method to DASS-21.

Other analyses provide evidence for maintaining the dimensional structure of the scale across different groups, such as the factor invariance calculation [45,46]. This technique has been applied to DASS-21 and has shown factor invariance for the three-dimensional model across a diverse group of college students [47]: from different countries [24, 48], gender [29, 49], age groups [35, 50] and for the full and nine-item versions of the scale for a non-clinical sample [42]. Other studies have reported invariance for the bifactor model between clinical and non-clinical samples [51] and among different countries [52].

Despite the variety of methods applied to DASS-21, this instrument has not yet undergone an analysis based on complex systems and network science. In several areas, phenomena are investigated as systems that, owing to their sensitivity to initial

conditions, non-linearity, emergent behavior and self-organization, can be classified as complex [53]. Psychometric research has presented this perspective in different fields of study in recent years, such as in psychopathology [54], persistent somatic symptoms [55], major depression [56] and anxiety and depression symptoms [57]. The network perspective investigates the multivariate data structure of DASS-21 in different situations, for example, by investigating associations between variables, identifying more important and intervention-sensitive variables from centrality indices and exploring the dimensional structure of the psychological scales [58].

Exploratory graph analysis (EGA) and bootstrap EGA (BootEGA) are two different types of network analysis. EGA and BootEGA were developed to estimate the number of dimensions in multivariate data using non-directional network models [59,60]. These analyses are part of a new perspective known as “network psychometrics”. Under this approach, attributes are conceptualized as causally linked variables (observable) that form an emergent network pattern or topology. This means that the organization of items is characterized as a complex system according to contextual variables [58]. Considering all the above, this research aims to employ contemporary (EGA and BootEGA) and traditional (CFA, composite reliability and factor invariance) analyses to DASS-21.

## **2. Methods**

### ***2.1. Study design***

This is a descriptive, correlational and quantitative research analysis because it represents the characteristics of the sample without having control over the variables described, understanding the correlations (whether linear or in a complex system)

among those variables and establishing parameters for comparison from the observations that have been made [61]. It is a cross-sectional study employing the snowball technique to increase the sample size [62], with a non-probability sample type since there was no randomization for the selection of participants [63].

## 2.2. *Participants*

The minimum sample size was calculated using G\*Power 3.1 software for iOS [64], adopting the parameter test of variance equality (two-sample case: ratio  $\text{variance1/variance0} = 1.5$ ) because usually there are twice as many females as males in studies involving DASS-21 (see 40, 64,65). We further adopted the recommendations of a sample consisting of 10 respondents per item but 25 for more conservative analyses and for CFA [45] and EGA [59]. The minimum sample comprised 714 participants, 416 of which were females.

Participants included were 18 years of age or older and a current student or professional from any of the five Brazilian regions. We excluded the following: incidental responses from different profiles intended in this research; participants who did not complete the DASS-21; and self-reported psychiatric and/or neurological diagnosis in the last two months from the date of response.

This study comprised 4017 people with a mean age of 31.16 years ( $SD = 10.308$ ). Most participants were female ( $N = 2791$ , 69.5%), college students (70.3%), self-described as Caucasian (60.8%) or brown (29.1%), single (63.0%) and with a monthly household income of 2–10 minimum wages (58.6%). Many participants did not disclose which Brazilian region they lived in (70.4%); however, among the respondents, most reported living in the Southeast region (76.4%). The mean of the DASS-21 total score was 23.98 ( $SD = 15.33$ ) for the overall sample, with a significant

148 mean difference for all items and for the DASS-21 total score between genders, with  
 149 minimum to moderate effect size (see Table 1).

150 **Table 1. Descriptive Analysis of Sociodemographic Characteristics and DASS-21**  
 151 **items between Gender of the Participants**

Sociodemographic characteristics													
DASS-21 items													
n % M SD sk kt n % M SD sk kt													
Age													
30.75 9.962													
Type of activity performed													
College student 1987 71.2 839 68.5													
Professionals 804 28.8 387 31.5													
Education													
Bachelors 1246 44.6 517 46.2													
Bachelor's degree 602 21.6 211 17.2													
Postgraduate degree/MBA 78 2.8 93 7.6													
Incomplete master's 248 8.9 95 7.7													
Master's Degree 261 9.4 111 9.1													
Incomplete doctorate 233 8.3 95 7.7													
Ph.D. 123 4.4 55 4.5													
Race (self-declared)													
African descendent 225 8.1 125 10.2													
Asian descendent 31 1.1 19 1.5													
Brown 808 29.0 359 29.3													
Caucasian 1723 61.7 721 58.8													
Indigenous 4 0.1 2 0.2													
Income													
No income 112 4.0 43 3.5													
Up to 2 minimum salaries 653 23.4 257 21.0													
From 02 up to 04 salaries 820 29.4 326 26.6													
From 04 up to 10 salaries 819 29.3 334 27.2													
From 10 up to 20 salaries 308 11.0 195 15.9													
Above 20 salaries 23 0.8 34 2.8													
Non-respondents 56 2.0 37 3.0													
Marital status													
Single 1760 63.1 772 63.0													
Married/Civil partnership 850 30.5 408 33.3													
Non-respondents 181 6.5 46 3.8													
Brazilian region													
North 19 2.3 10 0.3													
Northeast 77 9.5 36 0.3													
Center-west 34 4.2 19 0.4													
Southeast 628 78.1 280 5.7													
South 46 5.7 40 1.1													
Non-respondents 1987 71.2 841 68.6													
DASS-21 items													
01 - I found it hard to wind down 1.48 0.926 0.110 -0.840 1.22 0.942 0.398 -0.398													
02 - I was aware of dryness of my mouth 0.95 1.058 0.714 -0.822 0.71 0.969 1.109 -0.398													
03 - I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all 0.74 0.881 0.919 -0.147 0.66 0.864 1.117 0.398													
04 - I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion) 0.87 1.028 0.830 -0.606 0.56 0.889 1.467 1.099													
05 - I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things 1.74 1.042 -0.219 -1.172 1.44 1.059 0.099 -1.099													
06 - I tended to over-react to situations 1.44 1.028 0.117 -1.123 1.11 1.011 0.488 -0.398													
07 - I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands) 0.64 0.963 1.298 0.411 0.43 0.837 1.892 2.398													
08 - I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy 1.38 1.017 0.194 -1.066 1.05 0.992 0.558 -0.398													
09 - I was worried about situations in 1.07 1.101 0.544 -1.093 0.74 0.997 1.089 -0.398													

8



which I might panic and make a fool of myself

10 - I felt that I had nothing to look forward to	0.99	1.063	0.663	-0.875	0.86	1.005	0.833	-0.0
11 - I found myself getting agitated	1.61	1.004	-0.087	-1.078	1.35	1.031	0.194	-1.0
12 - I found it difficult to relax	1.81	0.993	-0.286	-1.035	1.47	1.024	0.079	-1.0
13 - I felt down-hearted and blue	1.59	1.060	-0.031	-1.237	1.22	1.062	0.362	-1.0
14 - I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing	1.32	1.016	0.251	-1.041	1.13	1.012	0.457	-0.0
15 - I felt I was close to panic	0.98	1.054	0.696	-0.801	0.64	0.938	1.284	0.0
16 - I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything	1.20	1.061	0.385	-1.094	0.97	1.017	0.686	-0.0
17 - I felt I wasn't worth much as a person	1.07	1.146	0.580	-1.153	0.85	1.068	0.920	-0.0
18 - I felt that I was rather touchy	1.84	0.993	-0.322	-1.024	1.27	1.059	0.341	-1.0
19 - I was aware of the beating of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat)	0.98	1.067	0.681	-0.868	0.72	0.976	1.161	0.0
20 - I felt scared without any good reason	1.13	1.086	0.481	-1.095	0.71	0.977	1.178	0.0
21 - I felt that life was meaningless	0.92	1.115	0.808	-0.820	0.77	1.041	1.062	-0.0
Total	25.78	15.335	0.364	-0.793	19.88	14.526	0.697	-0.0

152 *Note.* This table presents descriptive analyses of the sociodemographic and DASS-21 items divided by  
153 gender, <sup>a</sup> N = 2791 (69,48%), <sup>b</sup> N = 1226 (30,52%), n = sample, % = percentage, M = mean, SD = standard  
154 deviation, sk = skewness, kt = kurtosis, \*p < .001, d = Cohen's d effect size estimator (small = 0.2; medium  
155 = 0.5; large = 0.8, and very large = 1.3, [67].  
156

### 157 **2.3. Measures**

158 A sociodemographic questionnaire was developed for the purpose of obtaining data on  
159 age, gender (female, male, intersex), marital status (single, married, divorced, etc.), self-  
160 reported race (African descendant, Asian descendant, brown, indigenous and white),  
161 school background (elementary school, high school, college, etc.), family income,  
162 occupation (college student, professional) and region of residence (North, Northeast,  
163 Center-West, Southeast, South).

164 DASS-21 [3,68] was adapted to the Brazilian population by Vignola and Tucci  
165 [69]. It is composed of 21 items, with seven items for each subscale: depression ( $\alpha$  =  
166 .92), anxiety ( $\alpha$  = .86) and stress ( $\alpha$  = .90). The items are rated on a four-point Likert  
167 scale ranging from 0 ("did not apply at all") to 3 ("applied a lot or most of the time").  
168

### 169 **2.4. Procedures**

This investigation was carried out exclusively by web-based data collection (due to the COVID-19 pandemic) from April to August 2020.

The research team prepared an invitation letter explaining the purpose of the study, with a link providing access to the online form comprising the consent form, the sociodemographic questionnaire and DASS-21. It was forwarded by email to universities, companies/managers, hospitals and health/psychosocial care centers in different regions of the country and was also published on Facebook and Instagram accounts. Participants could also forward the form to other potential contributors.

This study was approved by an ethics and research committee involving human subjects under CAAE registration code 07077019.3.0000.5149, according to National Health Council (CNS) resolution numbers 466/2012 and 510/2016.

## **2.5. Statistical and data analysis**

### *2.5.1. Descriptive analysis*

Descriptive analyses were used to describe the characteristics of the sample [70]. Skewness, kurtosis, mean difference and effect size tests were applied to continuous variables, with gender as a comparison factor. When pertinent to the analyses, a p value of  $< .05$  was adopted.

### *2.5.2. EGA*

EGA is a recently developed method to estimate the number of dimensions in multivariate data using undirected network models [59,60]. EGA first applies a network estimation method followed by a community detection algorithm for weighted networks [71].

### 2.5.2.1. Network estimation method

This study applied the graphical Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (GLASSO [72,73], which estimates a Gaussian graphical model (GGM [74]) where nodes (circles) represent variables and edges (lines) represent the conditional dependence (or partial correlations) between nodes, given all other nodes in the network.

LASSO uses a parameter called lambda ( $\lambda$ ), which controls the sparsity of the network. Lower values of  $\lambda$  remove fewer edges, increasing the possibility of including spurious correlations, whereas larger values of  $\lambda$  remove more edges, increasing the possibility of removing relevant edges. When  $\lambda = 0$ , the estimates are equal to the ordinary least-squares solution for the partial correlation matrix. In this study, the ratio of the minimum and maximum  $\lambda$  was set to .1 (.5 is the higher value).

The popular approach in the network psychometrics literature is to compute models across several values of  $\lambda$  (usually 100) and to select the model that minimizes the extended Bayesian information criterion (EBIC [75,76]. The EBIC model selection uses a hyperparameter gamma ( $\gamma$ ) to control how much it prefers simpler models (i.e., models with fewer edges [77]. Larger  $\gamma$  values lead to simpler models, whereas smaller  $\gamma$  values lead to denser models. When  $\gamma = 0$ , the EBIC is equal to the Bayesian information criterion. In this study,  $\gamma$  was set to 0. In the network psychometrics literature, this approach has been termed EBICglasso and is applied using the qgraph package.

### 2.5.2.2. Community detection algorithm

The Walktrap algorithm [78] is a commonly applied community detection algorithm in the network psychometrics literature [59,60]. The algorithm begins by computing a

transition matrix where each element represents the probability of one node traversing to another (based on node strength or the sum of the connections to each node). Random walks are then initiated for a certain number of steps (e.g., 4) using the transition matrix for probable destinations. Using Ward's agglomerative clustering approach [79], each node starts as its own cluster and merges with adjacent clusters (based on squared distances between each cluster) in a way that minimizes the sum of squared distances between other clusters. Modularity [80] is then used to determine the optimal partition of clusters (i.e., communities). The Walktrap algorithm was implemented using the igraph package in R [81].

### 2.5.3. CFA and internal consistency

CFA using the unweighted least-squares estimator was conducted to test the internal structure of DASS-21 in seven different models, including the model originated by EGA. An adequate fit was considered when comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) values were  $> .90$ ; values of  $> .95$  indicated a good fit [82]. Root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) values of .08 and .06 indicated an acceptable fit, with values  $< .05$  indicating a good fit [82]. Factor loadings were considered adequate if they were  $\geq .40$ . Internal consistency was calculated from composite reliability [83]. Indices with values of  $\geq .80$  were considered adequate [84].

### 2.5.4. Factor invariance

Factor invariance of CFA for gender and occupation was tested on a DASS-21 four-factor model: configural invariance (equality for fit); weak or metric invariance (equality for factor loadings); strong invariance (equality for item intercepts); and strict invariance (equality for residual variances or uniqueness) [46]. The fit of the

configural model data was measured using CFI, TLI and RMSEA. The configural model would be rejected if it displayed  $CFI < .90$  or  $RMSEA \geq .08$ . The weak, strong and strict invariance models would be rejected if they displayed  $\Delta CFI > .005$  and  $\Delta TLI > .005$ .

The database for this research can be downloaded and cited from the following link <https://osf.io/xpabk/>.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. EGA and BootEGA

Figure 1a provides the estimated dimensionality of DASS-21 obtained using EGA. Four dimensions were estimated, with items distributed as follows: 01, 06, 08, 11, 12, 14 and 18 for the stress dimension and 03, 05, 10, 13, 16, 17 and 21 for the depression dimension; the anxiety dimension was divided into two, one with items 02, 04, 07 and 09 and the other with items 09, 15 and 20. Figure 1b provides the median dimensionality structure of the network (i.e., the network calculated as the median of the estimated partial regularized correlations between bootstrap networks).

**Figure 1. Dimensionality structure of DASS-21 from EGA (a) and BootEGA (b).**  
*Note.* Representation of the dimensional structure of the new DASS-21 model from EGA (a) and BootEGA; The lines in both figures and their thickness express the relationship between items. Items that have the same color are represented as belonging to the same dimension; red (1) = stress items, blue (2) = depression items, green (3) = anxiety items, and orange (4) = panic items. BootEGA supported the 4-factor model by 72.6%.

The original EGA structure with four dimensions was found in most of the dimensional solutions estimated via BootEGA. In addition to the four-factor dimensional structure in 72.6% of the interactions, a three-dimensional structure was observed in 26.5% and a five-dimensional structure in 9% of interactions. Item replication analyses indicated good replicability across all items in the four-dimensional model ( $> .65$ ) (Figure 2).

**Figure 2. Replication of the DASS-21 items for each of the original EGA dimensions.** *Note.* Replication of EGA DASS-21 Model for four dimensions. Best fits of replication are  $> .65$ .

### 3.2. CFA and internal consistency

The factor loadings of the DASS-21 items revealed appropriate factor loadings for all seven models tested (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Factor Loading and Coefficient Determination of DASS Tested Models**

Factors	Single Factor Models						Two factor models			
	Ruiz et al. [23]; Kyriazos et al. [42]		Gonzales-Riviera et al. [37]		Lovibond [85]; Schoever et al. [86]; Schoevers et al. [87]; Gloster et al. [38]		Gloster et al. [38]; Ruiz et al. [23]		Lovibond & Lovibond [3]; Page et al. [40]; Shea et al. [88]; Alfnsson et al. [39]; Ruiz et al. [23]	
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5					
Stress	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>
01	0.62*	0.44			0.69*	0.48	0.67*	0.45	0.68*	0.46
06	0.72*	0.48			0.73*	0.53	0.70*	0.49	0.71*	0.50
08	0.80*	0.62			0.82*	0.69	0.79*	0.63	0.80*	0.65
11	0.67*	0.43			0.69*	0.48	0.66*	0.44	0.67*	0.46
12	0.76*	0.56			0.79*	0.62	0.76*	0.57	0.76*	0.58
14	0.68*	0.44			0.69*	0.48	0.67*	0.45	0.67*	0.45
18	0.76*	0.52			0.76*	0.57	0.73*	0.54	0.73*	0.54
Depression										
03	0.50*	0.31	0.59*	0.31	0.57*	0.32	0.57*	0.32	0.61*	0.37
05	0.66*	0.39	0.68*	0.36	0.63*	0.39	0.63*	0.40	0.67*	0.45
10	0.72*	0.47			0.70*	0.49	0.70*	0.49	0.75*	0.56
13	0.87*	0.65	0.87*	0.63	0.82*	0.67	0.82*	0.67	0.87*	0.77
16	0.80*	0.58	0.85*	0.57	0.77*	0.59	0.77*	0.59	0.82*	0.68
17	0.81*	0.51			0.73*	0.53	0.72*	0.53	0.78*	0.61
21	0.75*	0.47			0.70*	0.49	0.69*	0.48	0.74*	0.56
Anxiety										
02	0.58*	0.31			0.57*	0.32	0.60*	0.37	0.57*	0.33
04	0.58*	0.33	0.69*	0.39	0.58*	0.34	0.63*	0.39	0.59*	0.35
07	0.55*	0.35	0.66*	0.38	0.60*	0.36	0.64*	0.42	0.60*	0.37
19	0.70*	0.44	0.77*	0.48	0.67*	0.46	0.72*	0.52	0.68*	0.46
Anxiety/ new factor										
09	0.79*	0.53	0.78*	0.54	0.74*	0.55	0.79*	0.62	0.74*	0.56
15	0.81*	0.61	0.85*	0.66	0.79*	0.63	0.85*	0.72	0.80*	0.64
20	0.78*	0.53	0.77*	0.55	0.74*	0.54	0.79*	0.62	0.74*	0.55

*Note.* Confirmatory factor analysis comparing the current model generated by EGA with replications of others previously tested in the literature; satisfactory factor loadings  $\geq .40$ ;  $R^2$  = coefficient determination; \*  $p < .001$ ; M1 = Model 1: which features clustering of all 21 items from the depression, anxiety, and stress subscales; M2 = Model 2: clusters items 03, 05, 13, and 16 from the depression subscale, and items 04, 07, 09, 15, 19, and 20 from anxiety subscale; M3 = Model 3: encompassing items from depression and anxiety

subscales as a factor differing from stress factor; M4 = Model 4: comprises the arrangement of the items from depression and stress subscales as a factor differing from anxiety factor; M5 = Model 5: encompassing items from anxiety and stress subscales as a factor differing from depression factor; M6 = Model 6: three factor model; items from depression, anxiety and stress subscales form specific factors, each one of them, setting a tridimensional model. M7 = Model 7: composed by four different factors consisting of depression and stress subscales, and the split between items 02, 04, 07, and 19, and 09, 15, and 20 from anxiety subscale.

All models showed very good fit indices (CFI and TLI > .95 and RMSEA ≤ .08) but Model 7 was the best of all because it also showed a non-significant chi-square value (see Table 3).

**Table 3. Fit Indexes of Replicated and New DASS-21 Models**

Model	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	SRMR
M1	2954.93*	189	0.99	0.98	0.060	0.040-0.070	0.060
M2	1186.33*	35	0.98	0.97	0.080	0.080-0.090	0.070
M3	2451.094*	188	0.98	0.98	0.055	0.053-0.057	0.074
M4	2221.741*	188	0.98	0.98	0.052	0.050-0.054	0.050
M5	1564.710*	188	0.99	0.99	0.043	0.041-0.045	0.043
M6	1060.12*	186	1.00	0.99	0.030	0.030-0.040	0.030
M7	899.09	183	1.00	1.00	0.030	0.029-0.033	0.030

*Note.* Confirmatory fit indices for each of the tested DASS-21 models, including the one with a new fourth dimension; the name of the models, factors, subscales and comprising items were described in table 2;  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; \* p < .01; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

The composite reliability values were .901 for depression, .894 for anxiety, .890 for stress and .842 for the new dimension.

### 3.3. Factor invariance

The overall fit indices were adequate for the configural model and there was invariance in all the procedures applied. These results support measurement invariance for the four-factor model and indicate the same underlying constructs observed for both men and women as for the type of activity performed by participants (see Table 4).

**Table 4. Factorial Invariance for DASS-21 New Model Applied for Gender and Type of Activity Performed by Participants**

Model	Model fit						Model differ
	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	$\Delta$ CFI
Gender							
M1: Configural	922.999	326	1.00	1.00	.030	.028-.032	-
M2: Weak	1070.289*	343	.996	.995	.032	.030-.035	.004
M3: Strong	1174.618*	359	.995	.995	.034	.032-.036	.001
M4: Strict	1307.507*	421	.995	.995	.032	.030-.034	.000
Type of activity performed							
M1: Configural	162.072	108	1.00	1.00	.030	.030-.034	-
M2: Weak	181.888*	129	.999	.999	.033	.031-.034	.001
M3: Strong	186.007*	139	.996	.995	.032	.032-.034	.003
M4: Strict	207.536*	152	.998	.998	.038	.024-.051	.002

*Note.* Factorial invariance considering gender and type of activity performed by participants;  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; \*p < .001; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation;  $\Delta$ CFI = Difference between Comparative Fit Indices;  $\Delta$ TLI = the difference between Tucker Lewis Indices.

## 4. Discussion

The principal purpose of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of DASS-21 from a network psychometrics perspective. The results revealed four dimensions in the scale, instead of three. CFA demonstrated that this model presents excellent fit indices – individual and overall – even better than those replicated from others previously tested in the literature. The composite reliability indices showed excellent values. The dimensions of the new model were invariant between sex and type of activity performed by participants. Thus, the applicability of the dimensional scores of the scale was demonstrated.

### 4.1. Sample characteristics and new approach for psychometric properties of DASS-



It is common for studies to point out significant differences in gender between the subscales of DASS-21 [20, 91], showing a higher prevalence of negative affective experiences for women compared to men [92]. This research reported significant difference between females and males' participants for each item of the scale and the total score, with small to medium effect sizes, which corroborates data already established by the literature.

Research regarding the psychometric properties of DASS-21 has mostly used EFA and CFA as the main tools to check the association between the scale items. We expect to see a greater amount of these types of studies due to the extensive use and adaptation of DASS-21 for different cultural contexts [2, 23, 37]. However, DASS-21 showed unsatisfactory confirmatory fit indices, even with a three-dimensional model being the most promising, as in the studies by Brown et al. [1], Clara et al. [90], and Daza et al. [66]. Other research also reported problems regarding the factor configuration of the DASS-21, since confirmatory models displayed appropriate fits on deleting one or more items or on associating residual variances between them [see 5, 8, 17, 37, 39, 48, 51, 93].

Unsatisfactory fit indices for DASS-21 dimensions persevered even when using ESEM and BESEM. It happens due to latent variables being measured through exploratory factor analysis, and in that sense, the explanation about a relationship between latent variables becomes more difficult due to multiple item cross-loadings [94]. Johnson et al. [16] observed that items related to anxiety factor loaded into the two other factors of the scale. Kyriazos et al. [42] showed there were excellent fits for a trifactor model for a shortened version of the scale. However, the relationship between

the dimensions was very strong, above .870 in all cases. Gomez et al. [2] verified that some items from both the anxiety and the stress subscales were poorly defined in terms of their target dimensions. Further studies on DASS-21 based on Item Response Theory (IRT) have also reported problems of item fitting [38, 95,96]. Thus, considering previous outcomes in the literature and the complex nature of the groups and scenarios that have been observed, then, we decided to employ EGA and BootEGA. In addition, a recent review of the literature has not yet reported studies in which such methodology has been applied to DASS-21.

Network analysis presented in this paper allows observing the strength of association among the items in which it is possible to verify the formation of clusters [59] and therefore does not aim to recognize a common latent trait [58]. Furthermore, using EGA as a technique to process the data, it was possible to identify four factors instead of three. The depression and stress factors were kept, while the anxiety subscale was divided into items 02 (I was aware of dryness of my mouth), 04 (I experienced breathing difficulty), 07 (I experienced trembling), and 19 (I was aware of the beating of my heart in the absence of physical exertion) in one factor, and items 09 (I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself), 15 (I felt I was close to panic), and 20 (I felt scared without any good reason) in another. Items from anxiety subscale have previously presented problems regarding their theoretical dimension [37], as they have been distributed among others [2,41 97]. However, this configuration among the anxiety subscale items had not yet been reported. In addition to the one new dimension, the values of empirical EGA communities were greater than .65 across items and their respective dimensions (see Figure 2). BootEGA checked the

consistency of the four-dimensional model derived for DASS-21. In addition, it was possible to establish the topological similarity between EGA and BootEGA from visual analysis (see Figure 1a and b).

CFA applied to this new model revealed better individual and overall fit indices, including a non-significant chi-square, compared to the others tested in this research. No associations were made among the measurement errors of the items and residuals to enhance the tested models. This was justified because all the models presented satisfactory fit indices and to avoid interfere with the parsimony approach in the interpretation of the results [45]. Most research used Cronbach's alpha to estimate dimensional and global internal consistency of DASS-21, with a few exceptions [16, 38, 42]. We chose to use composite reliability after the new model was defined, since it considers measurement errors, providing a more robust index to comprise the portion of estimating each item to its dimension [84], whereas alpha is calculated under the assumption that each item equally affects the variance of a factor [98,99]. The four factors showed excellent internal consistency.

Previous studies have reported evidence for factor invariance for DASS-21 three-dimensional model [24, 47-49]. The outcomes of this investigation pointed out there is factor invariance for DASS-21 four-dimensional model regarding gender and type of activity performed by participants which enables the scale for comparative statistics proposes. Future studies focusing on this approach can test the invariance of this new model considering other groups.

Both traditional and network psychometrics analyses have evidenced a new version for DASS-21 with four distinct dimensions. However, we have another two

tasks: define how the new arrangement it should be displayed and examine which further evidence is available to support the reallocation among the anxiety items scale into two new dimensions.

#### **4.2. Other support for a new dimension of DASS-21**

The model with three distinct DASS-21 dimensions is the most reported, although the results of this research demonstrated a split among items belonging to the anxiety subscale. Items 02, 04, 07 and 19 remained labeled as anxiety but what would be the most appropriate name for the dimension comprised of items 09, 15 and 20? DASS-21 was developed based on the recognition of symptoms related to affective and anxiety disturbances and works as a clinical screening method, although with no diagnostic intent [68, 100-102]. The new dimension was hereby nominated as "Panic" due to its items being related to panic disorder (PD), as a counterpart to generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) referring to the remaining items.

Studies have exhibited similarities between the etiology of PD and GAD [103,104] but they differ in other aspects. Such a distinction was first drawn in the 3rd edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* ([DSM-III], APA, [105]) based on the responses assigned to pharmacological treatments for each group [106]. Rapee [107] had identified hyperventilation and subtle onset of PD at an older age than people presenting with GAD. Panic is characterized by a set of sympathetic autonomic responses that culminate in anticipatory seizures, subjective discomfort and fear of losing control and/or dying [108-114], whereas GAD can be defined as a clinical condition held from distortions concerning ambiguous situations that are characterized

by uncertain consequences [115]. These two clinical conditions exhibit distinct comorbidities. Ibiloglu and Caykoylu [116] demonstrated that PD has greater comorbidity with bipolar disorder, whereas [80] and Wittchen et al. [117] reported greater comorbidity for GAD with depression, dysthymia, post-traumatic stress and social phobia. There are, however, other ways to distinguish PD and GAD besides phenomenological observations [113], such as neurophysiological, cognitive and psychological treatment plans.

People with PD are more sensitive to bodily sensations and prone to increased basal arousal throughout the day than those with GAD or non-anxious people [118]. A higher heart rate previously has been reported for PD when compared to GAD [119]. Analyses using machine learning have demonstrated that heart rate variability (HRV) measurement can differentiate PD from other anxiety disorders [113] and that people with PD are more prone to heart disease and death [120]. People with PD showed higher levels of interleukin 6 (IL-6) compared to GAD and therefore show better treatment response to escitalopram [121]. There is no clear distinction between prefrontal cortex function for emotion regulation in PD and GAD [122] but there is a distinction for several areas related to the emotional processing, social, planning and threat responses [123]. Thus, information processing may be impaired in both PD and GAD and simultaneously differentiates them in terms of cognitive function. Young adults with PD performed lower on verbal fluency compared to those with GAD, for which performance on memory tasks was shown to be impaired [124].

Interventions based on cognitive therapy have been reported to be effective in reducing both panic and anxiety symptoms [125] but varying in the treatment approach

[126]. One approach would be psychoeducation, a method in which the problems and their idiosyncrasies are explained [127,128]. Psychosocial interventions for panic symptoms are reliant on exposure, reassessment of physical symptoms and relaxation but are grounded in behavioral changes, re-evaluation of anxiety-inducing situations and cognitive restructuring for anxiety symptoms [127, 129]. This arises due to physical responses being misinterpreted and leading to a panic attack for those with PD [130] and by identifying and reinterpreting specific triggers linked to warning in ambiguous situations for those with GAD [131]. Applied relaxation reduces seizures and feelings of loss of control in panic [132] and levels of worry, physical responses and negative thoughts in anxiety [133]. Furthermore, follow-up studies revealed that people with GAD maintained their improved status for at least 12 months after treatment completion, whereas those with PD did not [134].

All the evidence above shows that there is differentiation between panic and anxiety. This research presented the formation of a new cluster from some items on the anxiety subscale. Analysis of the psychometric properties of DASS-21 revealed a distinction between characteristics that were once attributed only to anxiety but are better applied to panic, as described in the literature on PD and GAD. Thus, the results found in this research corroborate that the experience that differentiates panic and anxiety can be identified by DASS-21. In this sense, clinical practices and research that need to differentiate between these two conditions may rely on the use of a brief screening tool.

## **5. Strengths, limitations and implications**

The results of this research come from an emerging data analysis methodology [53, 58, 60]. Network psychometrics constitutes a new paradigm for understanding how items related to a specific construct associate as a complex system [135,136]. Computation of composite reliability, comparison among DASS-21 models already tested in the literature with the current one and observation of factor invariance by gender and type of activity of the participants revealed that the new factor should be on the agenda of upcoming research involving DASS-21, either by verifying its psychometric properties or for correlational studies. In addition, there is other strong empirical evidence supporting the new "Panic" dimension.

In contrast, this study has clear limitations. It is a non-probability and convenience sample where it was not possible to control the distribution of the number of participants among the different regions of the country. Data collection was conducted virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic and it was not possible, in accordance with social distance protocols, to carry out any part of the research in a face-to-face format.

In future studies, we suggest, initially, the use of classical and contemporary methods with the factor configuration found in this study for clinical samples. Finally, we propose an opportunity to revise the name of the scale. It would be pertinent to call it the Depression, Anxiety, Stress and Panic Scale (DASP-21). However, we believe that the scientific community will decide on the applicability of this name as several different versions of DASS-21 have emerged [see 4,12, 37, 42] even though none has yet described a fourth factor.

## 6. Conclusion

The results of this research have demonstrated the existence of four factors for DASS-21 in a non-clinical sample and this new model has shown improved fit indices. This study highlights the importance of network psychometrics as an analytical method applied to understanding how the items of a scale are arranged. Furthermore, this new factor configuration may support clinical screenings and treatment programs.

## Acknowledgements

National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Brazil. We would like to thank Professor Tatiana Cury Pollo, Ph.D. (Federal University of São João del-Rei, UFSJ) for proofreading and contributions to the improvement of this manuscript.

## References

1. Brown TA, Chorpita BF, Korotitsch W, Barlow DH. Psychometric properties of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) in clinical samples. *Behav Res Ther* 1997;35(1):79–89.
2. Gomez R, Stavropoulos V, Griffiths MD. Confirmatory factor analysis and exploratory structural equation modelling of the factor structure of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales-21. Fernández-Alcántara M, organizador. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(6):e0233998.
3. Lovibond SH, Lovibond PF. *Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales*. 4th ed. Psychology Foundation; 2004.
4. Ali AM, Alkhamees AA, Hori H, Kim Y, Kunugi H. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 21: Development and Validation of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 8-Item in Psychiatric Patients and the General Public for Easier Mental Health Measurement in a Post COVID-19 World. *IJERPH*. 2021;18(19):10142.
5. Henry JD, Crawford JR. The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *Br J Clin Psychol*. 2005;44(2):227–39.
6. Sinclair SJ, Siefert CJ, Slavin-Mulford JM, Stein MB, Renna M, Blais MA. Psychometric Evaluation and Normative Data for the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21) in a Nonclinical Sample of U.S. Adults. *Eval Health Prof*. 2012;35(3):259–79.



- 529 7. Mellor D, Vinet EV, Xu X, Hidayah Bt Mamat N, Richardson B, Román F. Factorial  
530 Invariance of the DASS-21 Among Adolescents in Four Countries.  
531 Eur J Psychol Assess. 2015;31(2):138–42.
- 532 8. Szabó M. The short version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21):  
533 Factor structure in a young adolescent sample. J Adolesc. 2010;33(1):1–8.
- 534 9. Gong X, Xie X-y, Xu R, Luo, Y-j. Psychometric properties of the Chinese versions  
535 of DASS-21 in Chinese college students. Chin. J. Clin. Psychol. 2010; 18(4): 443–  
536 446.
- 537 10. Patias ND, Machado WDL, Bandeira DR, Dell’Aglia DD. Depression Anxiety and  
538 Stress Scale (DASS-21) - Short Form: Adaptação e Validação para Adolescentes  
539 Brasileiros. Psico-USF. 2016;21(3):459–69.
- 540 11. Wise FM, Harris DW, Olver JH. The DASS-14: Improving the Construct Validity  
541 and Reliability of the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale in a Cohort of Health  
542 Professionals. J Allied Health, 2017;46(4): e85–e90.
- 543 12. Beaufort IN, De Weert-Van Oene GH, Buwalda VAJ, de Leeuw JRJ, Goudriaan  
544 AE. The Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21) as a Screener for  
545 Depression in Substance Use Disorder Inpatients: A Pilot Study. Eur Addict Res.  
546 2017;23(5):260–8.
- 547 13. Vaughan RS, Edwards EJ, MacIntyre TE. Mental Health Measurement in a Post  
548 Covid-19 World: Psychometric Properties and Invariance of the DASS-21 in  
549 Athletes and Non-athletes. Front Psychol. 2020;11:590559.
- 550 14. Martins BG, Silva WR da, Maroco J, Campos JADB. Escala de Depressão,  
551 Ansiedade e Estresse: propriedades psicométricas e prevalência das afetividades. J  
552 bras psiquiatr. 2019;68(1):32–41.
- 553 15. Lovibond PF. DASS translations; 2021.  
554 <http://www2.psy.unsw.edu.au/Groups/Dass/translations.htm>.
- 555 16. Johnson AR, Lawrence BJ, Corti EJ, Booth L, Gasson N, Thomas MG, et al.  
556 Suitability of the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale in Parkinson’s Disease. JPD.  
557 2016;6(3):609–16.
- 558 17. Ali AM, Green J. Factor structure of the depression anxiety stress Scale-21 (DASS-  
559 21): Unidimensionality of the Arabic version among Egyptian drug users. Subst  
560 Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2019;14(1):40.
- 561 18. Coker AO, Coker OO, Sanni D. Psychometric properties of the 21-item Depression  
562 Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS-21). Afr Res Rev. 2018;12(2):135.
- 563 19. Dreyer Z, Henn C, Hill C. Validation of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21  
564 (DASS-21) in a non-clinical sample of South African working adults. J Psychol Afr.  
565 2019;29(4):346–53.
- 566 20. Camacho Á, Cordero ED, Perkins T. Psychometric Properties of the DASS-21  
567 Among Latina/o College Students by the US-Mexico Border. J Immigr

- 568 Minor Health. 2016;18(5):1017–23.
- 569 21. Lee D. The convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the Depression  
570 Anxiety Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21). *J Affect Disord.* 2019;259:136–42.
- 571 22. Mella FR, Vinet EV, Muñoz, AMA. Escalas de Depresión, Ansiedad y Estrés  
572 (DASS-21): Adaptación y propiedades psicométricas en estudiantes secundarios de  
573 Temuco. *Rev. Argentina de Clin. Psicol.* 2014;23: 179–190.
- 574 23. Ruiz FJ, Martín MBG, Falcón JCS, González PO. The hierarchical factor structure  
575 of the Spanish version of Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale – 21. *Rev Int Psicol*  
576 *Ter Psicol.* 2017;17(1): 97-105.
- 577 24. Scholten S, Velten J, Bieda A, Zhang XC, Margraf J. Testing measurement  
578 invariance of the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales (DASS-21) across four  
579 countries. *Psychol Assess.* 2017;29(11):1376–90.
- 580 25. Alim M., Kibria SM, Lslam J, Uddin Z, Nessa M, Wahab A, Lslam M. Translation  
581 of DASS 21 into Bangla and validation among medical students. *Bang J Psychiatry.*  
582 2017; 28(2): 67-70. doi: 28.67.10.3329/bjpsy.v28i2.32740.
- 583 26. Apóstolo JLA, Tanner BA, Arfken CL. Confirmatory factor analysis of the  
584 portuguese Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21. *Rev Latino-Am Enfermagem.*  
585 2012;20(3):590–6.
- 586 27. Asghari A, Saed F, Dibajnia P. (2008). Psychometric properties of the Depression  
587 Anxiety Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21) in a non-clinical Iranian sample. *Int J Psycho.*  
588 2008; 2: 82-102.
- 589 28. Bibi A, Lin M, Zhang XC, Margraf J. Psychometric properties and measurement  
590 invariance of Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS -21) across cultures. *Int*  
591 *J Psychol.* 2020;55(6):916–25.
- 592 29. Jiang L, Yan Y, Jin Z-S, Hu M-L, Wang L, Song Y, et al. The Depression Anxiety  
593 Stress Scale-21 in Chinese Hospital Workers: Reliability, Latent Structure, and  
594 Measurement Invariance Across Genders. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11:247.
- 595 30. Musa R, Fadzil MA, Zain Z. Translation, validation and psychometric properties of  
596 Bahasa Malaysia version of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS).  
597 *ASEAN Journal of Psychiatry*, 2007; 8(2):82-89.
- 598 31. Pezirkianidis C, Karakasidou E, Lakioti A, Stalikas A, Galanakis M. Psychometric  
599 Properties of the Depression, Anxiety, Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21) in a Greek  
600 Sample. *PSYCH.* 2018;09(15):2933–50.
- 601 32. Nahaboo S. Validation of the French Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21)  
602 and predictors of depression in an adolescent Mauritian population. Doctoral Thesis.  
603 Aix-Marseille University, 2015. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1757.1367.
- 604 33. Rao S, Ramesh N. Depression, anxiety and stress levels in industrial workers: A  
605 pilot study in Bangalore, India. *Ind Psychiatry J.* 2015;24(1):23.

- 606 34. Sariçam H. The Psychometric Properties of Turkish Version of Depression Anxiety  
607 Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21) in Community and Clinical Samples. JCBPR.  
608 2018;7(1): 19–30.
- 609 35. Willemssen J, Markey S, Declercq F, Vanheule S. Negative emotionality in a large  
610 community sample of adolescents: the factor structure and measurement invariance  
611 of the short version of the depression anxiety stress scales (DASS-21). Stress and  
612 Health. 2011;27(3):e120–8.
- 613 36. Yıldırım A, Boysan M, Kefeli MC. Psychometric properties of the Turkish version  
614 of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21). Br J Guid Coun.  
615 2018;46(5):582–95.
- 616 37. González-Rivera JA, Pagán-Torres OM, Pérez-Torres EM. Depression, Anxiety and  
617 Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct Validity Problem in Hispanics. EJIHPE.  
618 2020;10(1):375–89.
- 619 38. Gloster AT, Rhoades HM, Novy D, Klotsche J, Senior A, Kunik M, et al.  
620 Psychometric properties of the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale-21 in older  
621 primary care patients. J Affect Disord. 2008 Oct;110(3):248-59.
- 622 39. Alphonsson S, Wallin E, Maathz P. Factor structure and validity of the Depression,  
623 Anxiety and Stress Scale-21 in Swedish translation. J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs.  
624 2017;24(2–3):154–62.
- 625 40. Page AC, Hooke GR, Morrison DL. Psychometric properties of the Depression  
626 Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) in depressed clinical samples. Br J Clin Psychol.  
627 2007;46(3):283–97.
- 628 41. Duffy CJ, Cunningham EG, Moore SM. Brief report: The factor structure of mood  
629 states in an early adolescent sample. J. Adolesc. 2005;28(5):677–80.
- 630 42. Kyriazos TA, Stalikas A, Prassa K, Yotsidi V. Can the Depression Anxiety Stress  
631 Scales Short Be Shorter? Factor Structure and Measurement Invariance of DASS-  
632 21 and DASS-9 in a Greek, Non-Clinical Sample. PSYCH. 2018;09(05):1095–127.
- 633 43. Asparouhov T, Muthén B. Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling. Struct  
634 Equ Modeling. 2009;16(3):397–438.
- 635 44. Marsh HW, Morin AJS, Parker PD, Kaur G. Exploratory Structural Equation  
636 Modeling: An Integration of the Best Features of Exploratory and Confirmatory  
637 Factor Analysis. Annu Rev Clin Psychol. 2014;10(1):85–110.
- 638 45. Byrne, B. M. Structural equation modeling with EQS: Basic concepts, applications,  
639 and programming. Routledge; 2013.
- 640 46. Putnick DL, Bornstein MH. Measurement invariance conventions and reporting:  
641 The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. Dev. Rev.  
642 2016;41:71–90.
- 643 47. Norton PJ. Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-21): Psychometric  
644 analysis across four racial groups. Anxiety Stress Coping. 2007;20(3):253–65.

- 645 48. Oei TPS, Sawang S, Goh YW, Mukhtar F. Using the Depression Anxiety Stress  
646 Scale 21 (DASS-21) across cultures. *Int J Psychol*. 2013;48(6):1018–29.
- 647 49. Lu S, Hu S, Guan Y, Xiao J, Cai D, Gao Z, et al. Measurement Invariance of the  
648 Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21 Across Gender in a Sample of Chinese  
649 University Students. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:2064.
- 650 50. Gomez R, Summers M, Summers A, Wolf A, Summers JJ. Depression Anxiety  
651 Stress Scales-21: Factor Structure and Test-Retest Invariance, and Temporal  
652 Stability and Uniqueness of Latent Factors in Older Adults. *J Psychopathol Behav*  
653 *Assess*. 2014;36(2):308–17.
- 654 51. Bottesi G, Ghisi M, Altoè G, Conforti E, Melli G, Sica C. The Italian version of the  
655 Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21: Factor structure and psychometric properties  
656 on community and clinical samples. *Compr Psychiatry*. 2015;60:170–81.
- 657 52. Zanon C, Brenner RE, Baptista MN, Vogel DL, Rubin M, Al-Darmaki FR, et al.  
658 Examining the Dimensionality, Reliability, and Invariance of the Depression,  
659 Anxiety, and Stress Scale–21 (DASS-21) Across Eight Countries. *Assessment*.  
660 2021;28(6):1531–44.
- 661 53. Caldarelli G. A perspective on complexity and networks science. *J Phys Complex*.  
662 2020;1(2):021001
- 663 54. Fried EI, Cramer AOJ. Moving Forward: Challenges and Directions for  
664 Psychopathological Network Theory and Methodology. *Perspect Psychol Sci*.  
665 2017;12(6):999–1020.
- 666 55. Senger K, Heider J, Kleinstäuber M, Sehlbrede M, Witthöft M, Schröder A.  
667 Network Analysis of Persistent Somatic Symptoms in Two Clinical Patient  
668 Samples. *Psychosom Med*. 2022;84(1):74–85.
- 669 56. Castellanos MÁ, Ausín B, Bestea S, González-Sanguino C, Muñoz M. A Network  
670 Analysis of Major Depressive Disorder Symptoms and Age- and Gender-Related  
671 Differences in People over 65 in a Madrid Community Sample (Spain). *IJERPH*.  
672 2020;17(23):8934.
- 673 57. Liu R, Chen X, Qi H, Feng Y, Su Z, Cheung T, Xiang Y T. Network analysis of  
674 depressive and anxiety symptoms in adolescents during and after the COVID-19  
675 outbreak peak. *J Affect Disord*. 2022;301: 463-471.
- 676 58. Borsboom D, Deserno MK, Rhemtulla M, Epskamp S, Fried EI, McNally RJ, et al.  
677 Network analysis of multivariate data in psychological science. *Nat Rev Methods*  
678 *Primers*. 2021;1(1):58.
- 679 59. Golino HF, Epskamp S. Exploratory graph analysis: A new approach for estimating  
680 the number of dimensions in psychological research. Voracek M, organizador. *PLoS*  
681 *ONE*. 2017;12(6):e0174035.
- 682 60. Golino H, Shi D, Christensen AP, Garrido LE, Nieto MD, Sadana R, et al.  
683 Investigating the performance of exploratory graph analysis and traditional  
684 techniques to identify the number of latent factors: A simulation and tutorial.

- 685 Psychol Methods. 2020;25(3):292–320.
- 686 61. Bairagi V, Munot MV. Research methodology: A practical and scientific approach.  
687 CRC Press: Taylor & Francis Group; 2019.
- 688 62. Neuman WL. Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. 7st  
689 ed. Pearson Education; 2014.
- 690 63. Kothari CR. Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. New Age  
691 International Pvt. Ltd., Publishers; 2004.
- 692 64. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang A-G. Statistical power analyses using  
693 G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods.  
694 2009;41(4):1149–60.
- 695 65. Bados A, Solanas A, Andrés R. Psychometric properties of the Spanish version of  
696 Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS). [Propiedades psicométricas de la  
697 versión española de las Escalas de Depresión, Ansiedad y Estrés (DASS)].  
698 Psicothema, 17(4), 679–683.
- 699 66. Daza P, Novy DM, Stanley MA, Averill P. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scale-  
700 21: Spanish Translation and Validation with a Hispanic Sample. J Psychopathol  
701 Behav Assess. 2002;24(3):195–205.
- 702 67. Rosenthal R, Rosnow R L. Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data  
703 analysis. 3rd ed. McGraw Hill; 2008.
- 704 68. Lovibond PF, Lovibond SH. The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison  
705 of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and  
706 Anxiety Inventories. Behav Res Ther. 1995;33(3):335–43.
- 707 69. Vignola RCB, Tucci AM. Adaptation and validation of the depression, anxiety and  
708 stress scale (DASS) to Brazilian Portuguese. J Affect Disord. 2014;155:104–9.
- 709 70. Field A. Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. 5th ed. Sage; 2018.
- 710 71. Fortunato S. Community detection in graphs. Phys Rep, 2010; 486: 3–5, 75–174.  
711 doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.
- 712 72. Friedman JH, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the  
713 graphical lasso. Biostatistics, 2008; 9(3): 432–441.
- 714 73. Friedman JH, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Glasso: graphical lasso-estimation of Gaussian  
715 graphical models. R package version 1.8. 2014.  
716 <https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=glasso>.
- 717 74. Lauritzen SL. Graphical models. Clarendon Press; 1996 .
- 718 75. Chen J, Chen Z. Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with  
719 large model spaces. Biometrika. 2008;95(3):759–71.
- 720 76. Epskamp S, Borsboom D, Fried EI. Estimating psychological networks and their



- accuracy: A tutorial paper. Behav Res. 2018;50(1):195–212.
77. Foygel R, Drton M. Extended Bayesian Information Criteria for Gaussian Graphical Models. Adv Neural Inf Process Syst. 2010; 23:2020-2028.
78. Pons P, Latapy M. Computing communities in large networks using random walks. J Graph Algorithms Appl. 2006;10: 191–218. doi: 10.7155/jgaa.00185.
79. Ward JH. Hierarchical clustering to optimise an objective function. J Am Stat Assoc, 1963;58: 238–244.
80. Newman MG, Shin KE, Zuellig AR. Developmental risk factors in generalized anxiety disorder and panic disorder. J Affect Disord. 2016;206:94–102.
81. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research. Int. j. complex syst., 2006; 1695: 1–9. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1d27/44b83519657f5f2610698a8ddd177ced4f5c.pdf>.
82. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Struct Equ Modeling, 1999; 6(1): 1–55.
83. Raykov T. Estimation of Composite Reliability for Congeneric Measures. Appl Psychol Meas. 1997;21(2):173–84.
84. Raykov T. Behavioral scale reliability and measurement invariance evaluation using latent variable modeling. Behav. Ther. 2004;35(2):299–331
85. Lovibond PF. Long-term stability of depression, anxiety, and stress syndromes. Jour Abn Psychol. 1998;107:520–526.
86. Schoevers RA, Beekman AT, Deeg DJ, Jonker C, van Tilburg W. Comorbidity and risk-patterns of depression, generalised anxiety disorder and mixed anxiety-depression in later life: results from the AMSTEL study. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2003;18(11): 994–1001. doi:10.1002/gps.100.
87. Schoevers RA, Deeg DJH, van Tilburg W, Beekman ATF. Depression and Generalized Anxiety Disorder: Co-Occurrence and Longitudinal Patterns in Elderly Patients. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2005;13(1):31–9.
88. Shea TL, Tennant A, Pallant JF. Rasch model analysis of the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS). BMC Psychiatry. 2009;9(1):21.
89. Antony MM, Bieling PJ, Cox BJ, Enns MW, Swinson RP. Psychometric properties of the 42-item and 21-item versions of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales in clinical groups and a community sample. Psychol Assess. 1998;10(2):176–81.
90. Clara IP, Cox BJ, Enns MW. Confirmatory factor analysis of the depression-Anxiety-Stress Scales in depressed and anxious patients. J Psychopathol Behav Assess. 2001;23(1):61–7.

- 758 91. Silva AC, Ezequiel OS, Lucchetti ALG, DiLalla LF, Lucchetti G. Empathy, well-  
759 being, and mental health: do gender differences diminish by the end of medical  
760 school? *Women Health*. 2021;61(3):254–64.
- 761 92. World Health Organization (WHO). Depression and other common mental  
762 disorders: global health estimates. World Health Organization. 2017. Available  
763 from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/254610>
- 764 93. Musa R, Maskat R. Psychometric Properties of Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 21-  
765 item (DASS-21) Malay Version among a Big Sample Population.  
766 *Mediterr. J. Clin. Psychol*. 2020;8(1).
- 767 94. Gu H, Wen Z, Fan X. Investigating the Multidimensionality of the Work-Related  
768 Flow Inventory (WOLF): A Bifactor Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling  
769 Framework. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:740.
- 770 95. Osman A, Wong JL, Bagge CL, Freedenthal S, Gutierrez PM, Lozano G. The  
771 Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21): Further Examination of  
772 Dimensions, Scale Reliability, and Correlates: Depression Anxiety Stress. *J Clin*  
773 *Psychol*. 2012;68(12):1322–38.
- 774 96. Parkitny L, McAuley JH, Walton D, Pena Costa LO, Refshauge KM, Wand BM, et  
775 al. Rasch analysis supports the use of the Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales to  
776 measure mood in groups but not in individuals with chronic low back pain. *J Clin*  
777 *Epidemiol*. 2012;65(2):189–98.
- 778 97. Tully PJ, Zajac IT, Venning AJ. The Structure of Anxiety and Depression in a  
779 Normative Sample of Younger and Older Australian Adolescents. *J Abnorm Child*  
780 *Psychol*. 2009;37(5):717–26.
- 781 98. Schmitt N. Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychol Assess*. 1996;8(4):350–3.
- 782 99. Tavakol M, Dennick R. Making sense of Cronbach’s alpha. *Int J Medical Education*.  
783 2011;2:53–5.
- 784 100. Ali AM, Alkhamees AA, Hori H, Kim Y, Kunugi H. The Depression Anxiety Stress  
785 Scale 21: Development and Validation of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 8-  
786 Item in Psychiatric Patients and the General Public for Easier Mental Health  
787 Measurement in a Post COVID-19 World. *IJERPH*. 2021;18(19):10142.
- 788 101. Clark LA, Watson D. Theoretical and empirical issues in differentiating depression  
789 from anxiety. In: Becker J, Kleinman A, editors. *Psychosocial aspects of depression*,  
790 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1991. pp. 39–65.
- 791 102. Habibi M, Dehghani M, Pooravari M, Salehi S. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of  
792 Persian Version of Depression, Anxiety and Stress (DASS-42): Non-Clinical  
793 Sample. *Razavi Int J Med*. 2017;5(4): e12021. doi: 10.5812/rijm.
- 794 103. Gottschalk MG, Domschke K. Genetics of generalized anxiety disorder and related  
795 traits. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. 2017;19(2):159–68.
- 796 104. Olaya B, Moneta MV, Miret M, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Haro JM. Epidemiology of panic

- 797 attacks, panic disorder and the moderating role of age: Results from a population-  
798 based study. *J Affect Disord.* 2018;241:627–33.
- 799 105. American Psychiatric Association. Manual diagnóstico e estatístico de transtornos  
800 mentais. Vol. 3. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1980.
- 801 106. Spitzer RL (1980). Classification of mental disorders and DSM-III. In: Kaplan HI,  
802 Freedman M, Sadock BJ, editors. Comprehensive textbook of psychiatry  
803 Williams and Wilkins; 1980. pp. 356-370.
- 804 107. Rapee RM. Distinctions between Panic Disorder and Generalised Anxiety Disorder:  
805 Clinical Presentation. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry.* 1985;19(3):227–32.
- 806 108. Asmundson GJ, Stein MB. Vagal attenuation in panic disorder: an assessment of  
807 parasympathetic nervous system function and subjective reactivity to respiratory  
808 manipulations. *Psychosom. Med.* 1994;56(3):187–93.
- 809 109. Hamm AO, Richter J, Pané-Farré CA. When the threat comes from inside the body:  
810 A neuroscience based learning perspective of the etiology of panic disorder. *Restor*  
811 *Neurol Neurosci.* 2014;32(1):79–93.
- 812 110. Holt PE, Andrews G. Hyperventilation and anxiety in panic disorder, social phobia,  
813 gad and normal controls. *Behav Res Ther.* 1989;27(4):453–60.
- 814 111. Islam MdS, Ferdous MostZ, Potenza MN. Panic and generalized anxiety during the  
815 COVID-19 pandemic among Bangladeshi people: An online pilot survey early in  
816 the outbreak. *J Affect Disord.* 2020;276:30–7.
- 817 112. Meuret AE, White KS, Ritz T, Roth WT, Hofmann SG, Brown TA. Panic attack  
818 symptom dimensions and their relationship to illness characteristics in panic  
819 disorder. *J. Psychiatr. Res.* 2006;40(6):520–7.
- 820 113. Na K-S, Cho S-E, Cho S-J. Machine learning-based discrimination of panic disorder  
821 from other anxiety disorders. *J Affect Disord.* 2021;278:1–4.
- 822 114. Perna G, Caldirola D. Is panic disorder a disorder of physical fitness? A heuristic  
823 proposal. *F1000Res.* 2018;7:294.
- 824 115. Hirsch CR, Krahé C, Whyte J, Krzyzanowski H, Meeten F, Norton S, et al. Internet-  
825 delivered interpretation training reduces worry and anxiety in individuals with  
826 generalized anxiety disorder: A randomized controlled experiment. *J Consult Clin*  
827 *Psychol.* 2021;89(7):575–89.
- 828 116. Ibiloglu AO, Caykoylu A. The comorbidity of anxiety disorders in bipolar I and  
829 bipolar II patients among Turkish population. *J Anxiety Disord.* 2011;25(5):661–7.
- 830 117. Wittchen H-U. DSM-III-R Generalized Anxiety Disorder in the National  
831 Comorbidity Survey. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1994;51(5):355.
- 832 118. Hoehn-Saric R, McLeod DR, Funderburk F, Kowalski P. Somatic Symptoms and  
833 Physiologic Responses in Generalized Anxiety Disorder and Panic Disorder: An  
834 Ambulatory Monitor Study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2004;61(9):913.




- 835 119. Chalmers JA, Quintana DS, Abbott MJ-A, Kemp AH. Anxiety Disorders are  
836 Associated with Reduced Heart Rate Variability: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Psychiatry*  
837 2014; 5:80.
- 838 120. Tully PJ, Turnbull DA, Beltrame J, Horowitz J, Cosh S, Baumeister H, et al. Panic  
839 disorder and incident coronary heart disease: a systematic review and meta-  
840 regression in 1 131 612 persons and 58 111 cardiac events. *Psychol Med*.  
841 2015;45(14):2909–20.
- 842 121. Zou Z, Zhou B, Huang Y, Wang J, Min W, Li T. Differences in cytokines between  
843 patients with generalised anxiety disorder and panic disorder. *J Psychosom Res*.  
844 2020;133:109975.
- 845 122. Ball TM, Ramsawh HJ, Campbell-Sills L, Paulus MP, Stein MB. Prefrontal  
846 dysfunction during emotion regulation in generalized anxiety and panic disorders.  
847 *Psychol Med*. 2013;43(7):1475–86.
- 848 123. Buff C, Brinkmann L, Neumeister P, Feldker K, Heitmann C, Gathmann B, et al.  
849 Specifically altered brain responses to threat in generalized anxiety disorder relative  
850 to social anxiety disorder and panic disorder. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2016;12:698–706.
- 851 124. Gayete S, Giné A, Miret M, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Haro JM, Olaya B. Cognitive  
852 function associated with different diagnoses of anxiety disorders over the lifespan:  
853 Results from a Spanish representative sample. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2020;75:102296.
- 854 125. Haby MM, Donnelly M, Corry J, Vos T. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for  
855 Depression, Panic Disorder and Generalized Anxiety Disorder: A Meta-Regression  
856 of Factors that May Predict Outcome. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2006;40(1):9–19.
- 857 126. Clark DA, Beck AT. *Cognitive Therapy of Anxiety disorders: Science and Practice*.  
858 Guilford Press; 2010.
- 859 127. Barlow DH, Allen LB, Basden, SL. Psychological treatments for panic disorders,  
860 phobias, and generalized anxiety disorder. In: Nathan PE, Gorman JM, editors. *A*  
861 *guide to treatments that work*. Oxford University Press; 2007. pp. 351–394.
- 862 128. Otto MW, Smits JA, Reese HE. *Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy for the Treatment of*  
863 *Anxiety Disorders*. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2004; 65(5): 34-41.
- 864 129. Montero-Marin J, Garcia-Campayo J, López-Montoyo A, Zabaleta-del-Olmo E,  
865 Cuijpers P. Is cognitive-behavioural therapy more effective than relaxation therapy  
866 in the treatment of anxiety disorders? A meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*.  
867 2018;48(9):1427–36.
- 868 130. Johnson PL, Federici LM, Shekhar A. Etiology, triggers and neurochemical circuits  
869 associated with unexpected, expected, and laboratory-induced panic attacks.  
870 *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2014;46:429–54.
- 871 131. Draheim AA, Anderson PL. Does cognitive behavioral therapy for anxiety disorders  
872 improve threat reappraisal?: A meta-analysis. *J Behav Cogn Ther*. 2021;31(2):125–  
873 35.


- 874 132. Öst L-G, Westling BE. Applied relaxation vs cognitive behavior therapy in the  
875 treatment of panic disorder. *Behav Res Ther.* 1995;33(2):145–58.
- 876 133. Öst L-G, Breitholtz E. Applied relaxation vs. cognitive therapy in the treatment of  
877 generalized anxiety disorder. *Behav. Res. Ther.* 2000;38(8):777–90.
- 878 134. van Dis EAM, van Veen SC, Hageraars MA, Batelaan NM, Bockting CLH, van den  
879 Heuvel RM, et al. Long-term Outcomes of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for  
880 Anxiety-Related Disorders: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA*  
881 *Psychiatry.* 2020;77(3):265.
- 882 135. Fried EI. Studying mental disorders as systems, not syndromes. *PsyArXiv*; 2021.  
883 Disponível em: <https://osf.io/k4mhv>.
- 884 136. Christensen AP, Golino H. On the equivalency of factor and network loadings.  
885 *Behav Res.* 2021;53(4):1563–80.

**Figure 1**





*a)*




*b)*



*Caption for artwork for figure 1:*

-  <sup>1</sup> = red;
-  <sup>2</sup> = blue;
-  <sup>3</sup> = green, and
-  <sup>4</sup> = orange

**Figure 2**



*Caption for artwork for figure 2:*

- 1 = red;
- 2 = blue;
- 3 = green, and
- 4 = orange.



#### *Descriptive Analysis of Sociodemographic Characteristics and DASS-21 items between Gender of the Participants*

[illegible]

Single	1760	63.1				772	63.0						
Married/Civil partnership	850	30.5				408	33.3						
Non-respondents	181	6.5				46	3.8						
Brazilian region													
North	19	2.3				10	0.3						
Northeast	77	9.5				36	0.3						
Center-west	34	4.2				19	0.4						
Southeast	628	78.1				280	5.7						
South	46	5.7				40	1.1						
Non-respondents	1987	71.2				841	68.6						
DASS-21 items													
01 - I found it hard to wind down			1.48	0.926	0.110	-0.840		1.22	0.942	0.398	-0.712	< .001*	0.28
02 - I was aware of dryness of my mouth			0.95	1.058	0.714	-0.822		0.71	0.969	1.109	-0.003	< .001*	0.24
03 - I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all			0.74	0.881	0.919	-0.147		0.66	0.864	1.117	0.308	.008*	0.09
04 - I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion)			0.87	1.028	0.830	-0.606		0.56	0.889	1.467	1.071	< .001*	0.32
05 - I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things			1.74	1.042	-0.219	-1.172		1.44	1.059	0.099	-1.207	< .001*	0.29
06 - I tended to over-react to situations			1.44	1.028	0.117	-1.123		1.11	1.011	0.488	-0.890	< .001*	0.32
07 - I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands)			0.64	0.963	1.298	0.411		0.43	0.837	1.892	2.490	< .001*	0.23
08 - I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy			1.38	1.017	0.194	-1.066		1.05	0.992	0.558	-0.780	< .001*	0.33
09 - I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself			1.07	1.101	0.544	-1.093		0.74	0.997	1.089	-0.102	< .001*	0.31
10 - I felt that I had nothing to look forward to			0.99	1.063	0.663	-0.875		0.86	1.005	0.833	-0.551	< .001*	0.13
11 - I found myself getting agitated			1.61	1.004	-0.087	-1.078		1.35	1.031	0.194	-1.109	< .001*	0.26
12 - I found it difficult to relax			1.81	0.993	-0.286	-1.035		1.47	1.024	0.079	-1.121	< .001*	0.38
13 - I felt down-hearted and blue			1.59	1.060	-0.031	-1.237		1.22	1.062	0.362	-1.113	< .001*	0.35

14 - I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing	1.32	1.016	0.251	-1.041	1.13	1.012	0.457	-0.915	< .001*	0.19
15 - I felt I was close to panic	0.98	1.054	0.696	-0.801	0.64	0.938	1.284	0.481	< .001*	0.34
16 - I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything	1.20	1.061	0.385	-1.094	0.97	1.017	0.686	-0.723	< .001*	0.22
17 - I felt I wasn't worth much as a person	1.07	1.146	0.580	-1.153	0.85	1.068	0.920	-0.552	< .001*	0.20
18 - I felt that I was rather touchy	1.84	0.993	-0.322	-1.024	1.27	1.059	0.341	-1.102	< .001*	0.56
19 - I was aware of the beating of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat)	0.98	1.067	0.681	-0.868	0.72	0.976	1.161	0.150	< .001*	0.25
20 - I felt scared without any good reason	1.13	1.086	0.481	-1.095	0.71	0.977	1.178	0.168	< .001*	0.41
21 - I felt that life was meaningless	0.92	1.115	0.808	-0.820	0.77	1.041	1.062	-0.246	< .001*	0.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.78</b>	<b>15.335</b>	<b>0.364</b>	<b>-0.793</b>	<b>19.88</b>	<b>14.526</b>	<b>0.697</b>	<b>-0.323</b>	<b>&lt; .001*</b>	<b>0.40</b>

*Note.* This table presents descriptive analyses of the sociodemographic and DASS-21 items divided by gender, <sup>a</sup> N = 2791 (69,48%), <sup>b</sup> N = 1226 (30,52%), n = sample, % = percentage, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, sk = skewness, kt = kurtosis, \*p < .001, d = Cohen's d effect size estimator (small = 0.2; medium = 0.5; large = 0.8, and very large = 1.3, Rosenthal & Rosnow, 2008).



**Table 2**

*Factor Loading and Coefficient Determination of DASS Tested Models*

Factors	Single Factor Models				Two factor models				Three factor model		Four factor model			
	Ruiz et al. (2017); Kyriazos et al. (2018)		Gonzales-Riviera et al. (2020)		Lovibond (1998); Schoever et al. (2003); Schoevers et al. (2005); Gloster et al. (2008)		Gloster et al. (2008); Ruiz et al. (2017)		Lovibond & Lovibond (2004); Page et al. (2007); Shea et al. (2009); Alfonsson et al. (2017); Ruiz et al. (2017)		Antony et al. (1998); Clara et al. (2001); Daza et al. (2002)		New proposal	
	M1		M2		M3		M4		M5		M6		M7	
Stress	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>	Factor loading	R <sup>2</sup>
01	0.62*	0.44			0.69*	0.48	0.67*	0.45	0.68*	0.46	0.65*	0.42	0.69*	0.48
06	0.72*	0.48			0.73*	0.53	0.70*	0.49	0.71*	0.50	0.76*	0.57	0.73*	0.53
08	0.80*	0.62			0.82*	0.69	0.79*	0.63	0.80*	0.65	0.84*	0.70	0.82*	0.68
11	0.67*	0.43			0.69*	0.48	0.66*	0.44	0.67*	0.46	0.71*	0.50	0.69*	0.48
12	0.76*	0.56			0.79*	0.62	0.76*	0.57	0.76*	0.58	0.80*	0.64	0.78*	0.62
14	0.68*	0.44			0.69*	0.48	0.67*	0.45	0.67*	0.45	0.71*	0.50	0.69*	0.48
18	0.76*	0.52			0.76*	0.57	0.73*	0.54	0.73*	0.54	0.80*	0.64	0.76*	0.57
Depression														
03	0.50*	0.31	0.59*	0.31	0.57*	0.32	0.57*	0.32	0.61*	0.37	0.53*	0.28	0.61*	0.37
05	0.66*	0.39	0.68*	0.36	0.63*	0.39	0.63*	0.40	0.67*	0.45	0.71*	0.50	0.67*	0.45
10	0.72*	0.47			0.70*	0.49	0.70*	0.49	0.75*	0.56	0.79*	0.63	0.75*	0.56
13	0.87*	0.65	0.87*	0.63	0.82*	0.67	0.82*	0.67	0.87*	0.77	0.94*	0.88	0.87*	0.77
16	0.80*	0.58	0.85*	0.57	0.77*	0.59	0.77*	0.59	0.82*	0.68	0.87*	0.75	0.82*	0.68
17	0.81*	0.51			0.73*	0.53	0.72*	0.53	0.78*	0.61	0.88*	0.77	0.78*	0.61
21	0.75*	0.47			0.70*	0.49	0.69*	0.48	0.74*	0.56	0.82*	0.67	0.74*	0.56
Anxiety														
02	0.58*	0.31			0.57*	0.32	0.60*	0.37	0.57*	0.33	0.63*	0.39	0.66*	0.43
04	0.58*	0.33	0.69*	0.39	0.58*	0.34	0.63*	0.39	0.59*	0.35	0.63*	0.39	0.68*	0.47

07	0.55*	0.35	0.66*	0.38	0.60*	0.36	0.64*	0.42	0.60*	0.37	0.60*	0.36	0.70*	0.49
19	0.70*	0.44	0.77*	0.48	0.67*	0.46	0.72*	0.52	0.68*	0.46	0.76*	0.57	0.79*	0.63
Anxiety/ new factor														
09	0.79*	0.53	0.78*	0.54	0.74*	0.55	0.79*	0.62	0.74*	0.56	0.86*	0.74	0.78*	0.62
15	0.81*	0.61	0.85*	0.66	0.79*	0.63	0.85*	0.72	0.80*	0.64	0.88*	0.77	0.84*	0.71
20	0.78*	0.53	0.77*	0.55	0.74*	0.54	0.79*	0.62	0.74*	0.55	0.85*	0.72	0.78*	0.61

*Note.* Confirmatory factor analysis comparing the current model generated by EGA with replications of others previously tested in the literature; satisfactory factor loadings  $\geq .40$ ;  $R^2$  = coefficient determination; \*  $p < .001$ ; M1 = Model 1: which features clustering of all 21 items from the depression, anxiety, and stress subscales; M2 = Model 2: clusters items 03, 05, 13, and 16 from the depression subscale, and items 04, 07, 09, 15, 19, and 20 from anxiety subscale; M3 = Model 3: encompassing items from depression and anxiety subscales as a factor differing from stress factor; M4 = Model 4: comprises the arrangement of the items from depression and stress subscales as a factor differing from anxiety factor; M5 = Model 5: encompassing items from anxiety and stress subscales as a factor differing from depression factor; M6 = Model 6: three factor model; items from depression, anxiety and stress subscales form specific factors, each one of them, setting a tridimensional model. M7 = Model 7: composed by four different factors consisting of depression and stress subscales, and the split between items 02, 04, 07, and 19, and 09, 15, and 20 from anxiety subscale.

**Table 3***Fit Indexes of Replicated and New DASS-21 Models*

Model	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	SRMR
M1	2954.93*	189	0.99	0.98	0.060	0.040-0.070	0.060
M2	1186.33*	35	0.98	0.97	0.080	0.080-0.090	0.070
M3	2451.094*	188	0.98	0.98	0.055	0.053-0.057	0.074
M4	2221.741*	188	0.98	0.98	0.052	0.050-0.054	0.050
M5	1564.710*	188	0.99	0.99	0.043	0.041-0.045	0.043
M6	1060.12*	186	1.00	0.99	0.030	0.030-0.040	0.030
M7	899.09	183	1.00	1.00	0.030	0.029-0.033	0.030

*Note.* Confirmatory fit indices for each of the tested DASS-21 models, including the one with a new fourth dimension; the name of the models, factors, subscales and comprising items were described in table 2;  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; \*  $p < .01$ ; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.

**Table 4***Factorial Invariance for DASS-21 New Model Applied for Gender and Type of Activity Performed by Participants*

Model	Model fit					Model difference		
	$\chi^2$	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	$\Delta$ CFI	$\Delta$ TLI
<b>Gender</b>								
M1: Configural	922.999	326	1.00	1.00	.030	.028-.032	-	-
M2: Weak	1070.289*	343	.996	.995	.032	.030-.035	.004	.005
M3: Strong	1174.618*	359	.995	.995	.034	.032-.036	.001	.000
M4: Strict	1307.507*	421	.995	.995	.032	.030-.034	.000	.000
<b>Type of activity performed</b>								
M1: Configural	162.072	108	1.00	1.00	.030	.030-.034	-	-
M2: Weak	181.888*	129	.999	.999	.033	.031-.034	.001	.001
M3: Strong	186.007*	139	.996	.995	.032	.032-.034	.003	.004
M4: Strict	207.536*	152	.998	.998	.038	.024-.051	.002	.003

*Note.* Factorial invariance considering gender and type of activity performed by participants;  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; \*p < .001; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation;  $\Delta$ CFI = Difference between Comparative Fit Indices;  $\Delta$ TLI = the difference between Tucker Lewis Indices.