

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

2

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

7

8 ¹ Departamento de Psicologia. Universidade Federal de São João del-Rei (UFSJ), São João del-
9 Rei, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia (UFSJ)

10 ² Departamento de Educação Física, Universidade Regional do Cariri, Crato, Ceará, Brazil

11 ³ Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação Física, Universidade Federal do Vale do São
12 Francisco (UNIVASF), Petrolina, Pernambuco, Brazil

13 ⁴ Departamento de Farmácia Social, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo
14 Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil

15 ⁴ Departamento de Psicologia, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte,
16 Minas Gerais, Brazil. Programa de Pós-Graduação Cognição e Comportamento (UFMG)

17

18 * Corresponding author

19 E-mail: alvarenga@ufsj.edu.br

20

21 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 & These authors also contributed equally to this work

23

24 #a Current Address: Department of Psychology. Federal University of Sao Joao del-Rei (UFSJ).

25 Praça Dom Helvecio, 74, 2.12B, Dom Bosco, São João del-Rei, Minas Gerais, Brazil

26

27 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 **Abstract**

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

48

49 **1. Introduction**

50 The short form of the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21) is a widely used
51 self-report instrument to assess affective-emotional changes related to mood and anxiety
52 [1-3]. This version presents a model with good discrimination among symptoms related

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

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

65 Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) have
66 been the methods most used to verify the psychometric properties of the scale [2], often
67 indicating a three-factor model. However, other models for DASS-21 have been
68 reported from such analyses. Henry and Crawford [5], for example, have shown a
69 model expressed by three factors (represented by items from the depression, anxiety and
70 stress subscales) and also by a single factor (general psychological distress), calling it a
71 bifactor model. Uni- and bidimensional models are also described in the literature: some
72 items from the depression and anxiety subscales are taken to form just one dimension
73 [37] the depression and anxiety subscales are classed as one dimension and the stress
74 subscale as another [38] the depression and stress subscales are classed as one
75 dimension and the anxiety subscale as another [23]; the anxiety and stress subscales are

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

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

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

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

99 conditions, non-linearity, emergent behavior and self-organization, can be classified as
100 complex [53]. Psychometric research has presented this perspective in different fields of
101 study in recent years, such as in psychopathology [54], persistent somatic symptoms
102 [55], major depression [56] and anxiety and depression symptoms [57]. The network
103 perspective investigates the multivariate data structure of DASS-21 in different
104 situations, for example, by investigating associations between variables, identifying
105 more important and intervention-sensitive variables from centrality indices and
106 exploring the dimensional structure of the psychological scales [58].

107 Exploratory graph analysis (EGA) and bootstrap EGA (BootEGA) are two
108 different types of network analysis. EGA and BootEGA were developed to estimate the
109 number of dimensions in multivariate data using non-directional network models
110 [59,60]. These analyses are part of a new perspective known as “network
111 psychometrics”. Under this approach, attributes are conceptualized as causally linked
112 variables (observable) that form an emergent network pattern or topology. This means
113 that the organization of items is characterized as a complex system according to
114 contextual variables [58]. Considering all the above, this research aims to employ
115 contemporary (EGA and BootEGA) and traditional (CFA, composite reliability and
116 factor invariance) analyses to DASS-21.

117

118 **2. Methods**

119 **2.1. Study design**

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

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

127

128 **2.2. Participants**

129 The minimum sample size was calculated using G*Power 3.1 software for iOS [64],
130 adopting the parameter test of variance equality (two-sample case: ratio
131 $\text{variance1/variance0} = 1.5$) because usually there are twice as many females as males in
132 studies involving DASS-21 (see 40, 64,65). We further adopted the recommendations of
133 a sample consisting of 10 respondents per item but 25 for more conservative analyses
134 and for CFA [45] and EGA [59]. The minimum sample comprised 714 participants, 416
135 of which were females.

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

141 This study comprised 4017 people with a mean age of 31.16 years (SD =
142 10.308). Most participants were female (N = 2791, 60.5%), college students (70.3%),
143 self-described as Caucasian (60.8%) or brown (29.1%), single (63.0%) and with a
144 monthly household income of 2–10 minimum wages (58.6%). Many participants did
145 not disclose which Brazilian region they lived in (70.4%); however, among the
146 respondents, most reported living in the Southeast region (76.4%). The mean of the
147 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**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.29.22274986>; this version posted July 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	n	%	M	SD	sk	kt	n	%	M	SD	sk	kt
Age			30.75	9.962					32.10	11.002		
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	-0.3
02 - I was aware of dryness of my mouth			0.95	1.058	0.714	-0.822			0.71	0.969	1.109	-0.3
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	0.3
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	1.0
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	-1.0
06 - I tended to over-react to situations			1.44	1.028	0.117	-1.123			1.11	1.011	0.488	-0.3
07 - I experienced trembling (e.g., in the hands)			0.64	0.963	1.298	0.411			0.43	0.837	1.892	2.3
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	-0.3
09 - I was worried about situations in			1.07	1.101	0.544	-1.093			0.74	0.997	1.089	-0.3

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.
11 - I found myself getting agitated	1.61	1.004	-0.087	-1.078	1.35	1.031	0.194	-1.
12 - I found it difficult to relax	1.81	0.993	-0.286	-1.035	1.47	1.024	0.079	-1.
13 - I felt down-hearted and blue	1.59	1.060	-0.031	-1.237	1.22	1.062	0.362	-1.
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.
15 - I felt I was close to panic	0.98	1.054	0.696	-0.801	0.64	0.938	1.284	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.
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.
18 - I felt that I was rather touchy	1.84	0.993	-0.322	-1.024	1.27	1.059	0.341	-1.
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.
20 - I felt scared without any good reason	1.13	1.086	0.481	-1.095	0.71	0.977	1.178	0.
21 - I felt that life was meaningless	0.92	1.115	0.808	-0.820	0.77	1.041	1.062	-0.
Total	25.78	15.335	0.364	-0.793	19.88	14.526	0.697	-0.

152 *Note.* This table presents descriptive analyses of the sociodemographic and DASS-21 items divided by
 153 gender, ^a N = 2791 (69,48%), ^b 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**

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

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

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

181

182 **2.5. Statistical and data analysis**

183 *2.5.1. Descriptive analysis*

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

188

189 *2.5.2. EGA*

190 EGA is a recently developed method to estimate the number of dimensions in
191 multivariate data using undirected network models [59,60]. EGA first applies a network
192 estimation method followed by a community detection algorithm for weighted networks
193 [71].

194

195 *2.5.2.1. Network estimation method*

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

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

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

216

217 *2.5.2.2. Community detection algorithm*

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

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

229

230 *2.5.3. CFA and internal consistency*

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

239

240 *2.5.4. Factor invariance*

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

245 configural model data was measured using CFI, TLI and RMSEA. The configural
246 model would be rejected if it displayed $CFI < .90$ or $RMSEA \geq .08$. The weak, strong
247 and strict invariance models would be rejected if they displayed $\Delta CFI > .005$ and ΔTLI
248 $> .005$.

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

251 **3. Results**

252 **3.1. EGA and BootEGA**

253 Figure 1a provides the estimated dimensionality of DASS-21 obtained using EGA. Four
254 dimensions were estimated, with items distributed as follows: 01, 06, 08, 11, 12, 14 and
255 18 for the stress dimension and 03, 05, 10, 13, 16, 17 and 21 for the depression
256 dimension; the anxiety dimension was divided into two, one with items 02, 04, 07 and
257 09 and the other with items 09, 15 and 20. Figure 1b provides the median
258 dimensionality structure of the network (i.e., the network calculated as the median of
259 the estimated partial regularized correlations between bootstrap networks).

260 **Figure 1. Dimensionality structure of DASS-21 from EGA (a) and BootEGA (b).**
261 *Note.* Representation of the dimensional structure of the new DASS-21 model from
262 EGA (a) and BootEGA; The lines in both figures and their thickness express the
263 relationship between items. Items that have the same color are represented as belonging
264 to the same dimension; red (1) = stress items, blue (2) = depression items, green (3) =
265 anxiety items, and orange (4) = panic items. BootEGA supported the 4-factor model by
266 72.6%.

267
268 The original EGA structure with four dimensions was found in most of the
269 dimensional solutions estimated via BootEGA. In addition to the four-factor
270 dimensional structure in 72.6% of the interactions, a three-dimensional structure was
271 observed in 26.5% and a five-dimensional structure in 9% of interactions. Item
272 replication analyses indicated good replicability across all items in the four-dimensional
273 model ($> .65$) (Figure 2).

274 **Figure 2. Replication of the DASS-21 items for each of the original EGA**
 275 **dimensions.** *Note.* Replication of EGA DASS-21 Model for four dimensions. Best fits
 276 of replication are > .65.
 277

278 **3.2. CFA and internal consistency**

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

281 **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	
	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²
Stress										
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

282 *Note.* Confirmatory factor analysis comparing the current model generated by EGA with replications of
 283 others previously tested in the literature; satisfactory factor loadings $\geq .40$; R² = coefficient determination;
 284 * p < .001; M1 = Model 1: which features clustering of all 21 items from the depression, anxiety, and stress
 285 subscales; M2 = Model 2: clusters items 03, 05, 13, and 16 from the depression subscale, and items 04, 07,
 286 09, 15, 19, and 20 from anxiety subscale; M3 = Model 3: encompassing items from depression and anxiety

287 subscales as a factor differing from stress factor; M4 = Model 4: comprises the arrangement of the items
 288 from depression and stress subscales as a factor differing from anxiety factor; M5 = Model 5: encompassing
 289 items from anxiety and stress subscales as a factor differing from depression factor; M6 = Model 6: three
 290 factor model; items from depression, anxiety and stress subscales form specific factors, each one of them,
 291 setting a tridimensional model. M7 = Model 7: composed by four different factors consisting of depression
 292 and stress subscales, and the split between items 02, 04, 07, and 19, and 09, 15, and 20 from anxiety
 293 subscale.
 294

295 All models showed very good fit indices (CFI and TLI > .95 and RMSEA ≤ .08)
 296 but Model 7 was the best of all because it also showed a non-significant chi-square
 297 value (see Table 3).
 298

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

Model	χ^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

300 *Note.* Confirmatory fit indices for each of the tested DASS-21 models, including the one with a new fourth
 301 dimension; the name of the models, factors, subscales and comprising items were described in table 2; χ^2 =
 302 chi-square; * p < .01; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index;
 303 RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-
 304 Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.
 305

306 The composite reliability values were .901 for depression, .894 for anxiety, .890
 307 for stress and .842 for the new dimension.
 308

309 **3.3. Factor invariance**

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

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

Model	Model fit						Model differ
	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	
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

316 *Note.* Factorial invariance considering gender and type of activity performed by participants; χ^2 = chi-
 317 square; *p < .001; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker Lewis Index;
 318 RMSEA = Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation; CI RMSEA = Confidence Interval of Root-Mean-
 319 Square Error of Approximation; Δ CFI = Difference between Comparative Fit Indices; Δ TLI = the
 320 difference between Tucker Lewis Indices.
 321

322 4. Discussion

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

331

332 4.1. Sample characteristics and new approach for psychometric properties of DASS-

333 21

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

340 Research regarding the psychometric properties of DASS-21 has mostly used
341 EFA and CFA as the main tools to check the association between the scale items. We
342 expect to see a greater amount of these types of studies due to the extensive use and
343 adaptation of DASS-21 for different cultural contexts [2, 23, 37]. However, DASS-21
344 showed unsatisfactory confirmatory fit indices, even with a three-dimensional model
345 being the most promising, as in the studies by Brown et al. [1], Clara et al. [90], and
346 Daza et al. [66]. Other research also reported problems regarding the factor
347 configuration of the DASS-21, since confirmatory models displayed appropriate fits on
348 deleting one or more items or on associating residual variances between them [see 5, 8,
349 17, 37, 39, 48, 51, 93].

350 Unsatisfactory fit indices for DASS-21 dimensions persevered even when using
351 ESEM and BESEM. It happens due to latent variables being measured through
352 exploratory factor analysis, and in that sense, the explanation about a relationship
353 between latent variables becomes more difficult due to multiple item cross-loadings
354 [94]. Johnson et al. [16] observed that items related to anxiety factor loaded into the two
355 other factors of the scale. Kyriazos et al. [42] showed there were excellent fits for a
356 trifactor model for a shortened version of the scale. However, the relationship between

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

365 Network analysis presented in this paper allows observing the strength of
366 association among the items in which it is possible to verify the formation of clusters
367 [59] and therefore does not aim to recognize a common latent trait [58]. Furthermore,
368 using EGA as a technique to process the data, it was possible to identify four factors
369 instead of three. The depression and stress factors were kept, while the anxiety subscale
370 was divided into items 02 (I was aware of dryness of my mouth), 04 (I experienced
371 breathing difficulty), 07 (I experienced trembling), and 19 (I was aware of the beating
372 of my heart in the absence of physical exertion) in one factor, and items 09 (I was
373 worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself), 15 (I felt I
374 was close to panic), and 20 (I felt scared without any good reason) in another. Items
375 from anxiety subscale have previously presented problems regarding their theoretical
376 dimension [37], as they have been distributed among others [2,41 97]. However, this
377 configuration among the anxiety subscale items had not yet been reported. In addition to
378 the one new dimension, the values of empirical EGA communities were greater than .65
379 across items and their respective dimensions (see Figure 2). BootEGA checked the

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

383 CFA applied to this new model revealed better individual and overall fit indices,
384 including a non-significant chi-square, compared to the others tested in this research.
385 No associations were made among the measurement errors of the items and residuals to
386 enhance the tested models. This was justified because all the models presented
387 satisfactory fit indices and to avoid interfere with the parsimony approach in the
388 interpretation of the results [45]. Most research used Cronbach's alpha to estimate
389 dimensional and global internal consistency of DASS-21, with a few exceptions [16, 38,
390 42]. We chose to use composite reliability after the new model was defined, since it
391 considers measurement errors, providing a more robust index to comprise the portion of
392 estimating each item to its dimension [84], whereas alpha is calculated under the
393 assumption that each item equally affects the variance of a factor [98,99]. The four
394 factors showed excellent internal consistency.

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

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

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

406

407 ***4.2. Other support for a new dimension of DASS-21***

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

417 Studies have exhibited similarities between the etiology of PD and GAD
418 [103,104] but they differ in other aspects. Such a distinction was first drawn in the 3rd
419 edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* ([DSM-III], APA,
420 [105]) based on the responses assigned to pharmacological treatments for each group
421 [106]. Rapee [107] had identified hyperventilation and subtle onset of PD at an older
422 age than people presenting with GAD. Panic is characterized by a set of sympathetic
423 autonomic responses that culminate in anticipatory seizures, subjective discomfort and
424 fear of losing control and/or dying [108-114], whereas GAD can be defined as a clinical
425 condition held from distortions concerning ambiguous situations that are characterized

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

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

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

449 [126]. One approach would be psychoeducation, a method in which the problems and
450 their idiosyncrasies are explained [127,128]. Psychosocial interventions for panic
451 symptoms are reliant on exposure, reassessment of physical symptoms and relaxation
452 but are grounded in behavioral changes, re-evaluation of anxiety-inducing situations and
453 cognitive restructuring for anxiety symptoms [127, 129]. This arises due to physical
454 responses being misinterpreted and leading to a panic attack for those with PD [130]
455 and by identifying and reinterpreting specific triggers linked to warning in ambiguous
456 situations for those with GAD [131]. Applied relaxation reduces seizures and feelings of
457 loss of control in panic [132] and levels of worry, physical responses and negative
458 thoughts in anxiety [133]. Furthermore, follow-up studies revealed that people with
459 GAD maintained their improved status for at least 12 months after treatment
460 completion, whereas those with PD did not [134].

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

470

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

472 The results of this research come from an emerging data analysis methodology [53, 58,
473 60]. Network psychometrics constitutes a new paradigm for understanding how items
474 related to a specific construct associate as a complex system [135,136]. Computation of
475 composite reliability, comparison among DASS-21 models already tested in the
476 literature with the current one and observation of factor invariance by gender and type
477 of activity of the participants revealed that the new factor should be on the agenda of
478 upcoming research involving DASS-21, either by verifying its psychometric properties
479 or for correlational studies. In addition, there is other strong empirical evidence
480 supporting the new "Panic" dimension.

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

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

494

495 **6. Conclusion**

496 The results of this research have demonstrated the existence of four factors for DASS-
497 21 in a non-clinical sample and this new model has shown improved fit indices. This
498 study highlights the importance of network psychometrics as an analytical method
499 applied to understanding how the items of a scale are arranged. Furthermore, this new
500 factor configuration may support clinical screenings and treatment programs.

501

502 **Acknowledgements**

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

507

508 **References**

- 509 1. Brown TA, Chorpita BF, Korotitsch W, Barlow DH. Psychometric properties of the
510 Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) in clinical samples. *Behav Res Ther*
511 1997;35(1):79–89.
- 512 2. Gomez R, Stavropoulos V, Griffiths MD. Confirmatory factor analysis and
513 exploratory structural equation modelling of the factor structure of the Depression
514 Anxiety and Stress Scales-21. Fernández-Alcántara M, organizador. *PLoS ONE*.
515 2020;15(6):e0233998.
- 516 3. Lovibond SH, Lovibond PF. *Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales*. 4th
517 ed. Psychology Foundation; 2004.
- 518 4. Ali AM, Alkhamees AA, Hori H, Kim Y, Kunugi H. The Depression Anxiety Stress
519 Scale 21: Development and Validation of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 8-
520 Item in Psychiatric Patients and the General Public for Easier Mental Health
521 Measurement in a Post COVID-19 World. *IJERPH*. 2021;18(19):10142.
- 522 5. Henry JD, Crawford JR. The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress
523 Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical
524 sample. *Br J Clin Psychol*. 2005;44(2):227–39.
- 525 6. Sinclair SJ, Siefert CJ, Slavin-Mulford JM, Stein MB, Renna M, Blais MA.
526 Psychometric Evaluation and Normative Data for the Depression, Anxiety, and
527 Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21) in a Nonclinical Sample of U.S. Adults. *Eval Health*
528 *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’Aglío 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. Willemsen 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. Alfonsson 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

- 721 accuracy: A tutorial paper. *Behav Res.* 2018;50(1):195–212.
- 722 77. Foygel R, Drton M. Extended Bayesian Information Criteria for Gaussian Graphical
723 Models. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst.* 2010; 23:2020-2028.
- 724 78. Pons P, Latapy M. Computing communities in large networks using random walks.
725 *J Graph Algorithms Appl.* 2006;10: 191–218. doi: 10.7155/jgaa.00185.
- 726 79. Ward JH. Hierarchical clustering to optimise an objective function. *J Am Stat Assoc,*
727 1963;58: 238–244.
- 728 80. Newman MG, Shin KE, Zuellig AR. Developmental risk factors in generalized
729 anxiety disorder and panic disorder. *J Affect Disord.* 2016;206:94–102.
- 730 81. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research.
731 *Int. j. complex syst.,* 2006; 1695: 1–9.
732 [https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1d27/44b83519657f5f2610698a8ddd177ced4f5c.](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1d27/44b83519657f5f2610698a8ddd177ced4f5c.pdf)
733 pdf.
- 734 82. Hu L, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
735 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct Equ Modeling,* 1999; 6(1): 1–
736 55.
- 737 83. Raykov T. Estimation of Composite Reliability for Congeneric Measures. *Appl*
738 *Psychol Meas.* 1997;21(2):173–84.
- 739 84. Raykov T. Behavioral scale reliability and measurement invariance evaluation using
740 latent variable modeling. *Behav. Ther.* 2004;35(2):299–331
- 741 85. Lovibond PF. Long-term stability of depression, anxiety, and stress syndromes. *Jour*
742 *Abn Psychol.* 1998;107:520–526.
- 743 86. Schoevers RA, Beekman AT, Deeg DJ, Jonker C, van Tilburg W. Comorbidity and
744 risk-patterns of depression, generalised anxiety disorder and mixed anxiety-
745 depression in later life: results from the AMSTEL study. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*
746 2003;18(11): 994–1001. doi:10.1002/gps.100.
- 747 87. Schoevers RA, Deeg DJH, van Tilburg W, Beekman ATF. Depression and
748 Generalized Anxiety Disorder: Co-Occurrence and Longitudinal Patterns in Elderly
749 Patients. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2005;13(1):31–9.
- 750 88. Shea TL, Tennant A, Pallant JF. Rasch model analysis of the Depression, Anxiety
751 and Stress Scales (DASS). *BMC Psychiatry.* 2009;9(1):21.
- 752 89. Antony MM, Bieling PJ, Cox BJ, Enns MW, Swinson RP. Psychometric properties
753 of the 42-item and 21-item versions of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales in
754 clinical groups and a community sample. *Psychol Assess.* 1998;10(2):176–81.
- 755 90. Clara IP, Cox BJ, Enns MW. Confirmatory factor analysis of the depression-
756 Anxiety-Stress Scales in depressed and anxious patients. *J Psychopathol Behav*
757 *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, Hagedaars 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:

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

Figure 2



Caption for artwork for figure 2:

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

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
Total	25.78	15.335	0.364	-0.793	19.88	14.526	0.697	-0.323	< .001*	0.40

Note. This table presents descriptive analyses of the sociodemographic and DASS-21 items divided by gender, ^a N = 2791 (69,48%), ^b 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); Alfonsso 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	
	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²	Factor loading	R ²
Stress														
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	χ^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; χ^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		
	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI RMSEA	Δ CFI	Δ TLI
Gender								
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
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	.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; χ^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; Δ CFI = Difference between Comparative Fit Indices; Δ TLI = the difference between Tucker Lewis Indices.