

Peer Review

Review of: "Validation of the Young Schema Questionnaire (YSQ-S3) in Mexican University Students"

Alfredo Ignacio Cisneros Romero¹

1. Independent researcher

Overall Assessment:

This article offers an exploratory, cross-sectional study to adapt and validate the Young Schema Questionnaire Short Form 3 (YSQ-S3) for 772 Mexican university students, resulting in the YSQ-S3-MX—a version capturing 17 of 18 Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMS) across 5 dimensions, with solid psychometric properties ($\alpha = 0.959$, 65.226% variance explained). The authors tackle a gap in Mexican psychological research with a thoughtful and thorough approach, delivering a tool with real potential for clinical practice and research within Schema Therapy and cognitive-behavioral frameworks. I genuinely appreciate their effort to tailor this instrument to a Mexican context and their detailed analysis. That said, there are a few areas where clarity, consistency, and depth could use a boost to make this work even stronger.

1. Abstract

- *Strengths:* It highlights a robust sample size ($n = 772$), impressive internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.962$), and a 17-EMS structure across 5 dimensions, underscoring its practical value for clinicians and researchers.
- *Suggestions:* It'd help to specify which EMS was left out and why, toss in a key CFA fit index (like RMSEA), and fix the incomplete phrase “from different states of was used” to make it polished.

2. Introduction

- *Strengths:* The authors build a strong case for EMS and the YSQ-S3, leaning on foundational works (e.g., Schmidt et al., 1995) and global studies, while spotlighting the need for a Mexican version with only one prior study in Hidalgo as a benchmark.

- *Suggestions:* A quick EMS definition would welcome newcomers, linking the literature to students' emotional challenges could sharpen the focus, and hinting at Mexican cultural influences would add depth.

3. Method (Design, Participants, Instruments)

- *Strengths:* The exploratory, cross-sectional design fits the goal, and the large sample (843 initially, 772 final) exceeds psychometric benchmarks (Nunnally, Martínez-Arias), with clear inclusion/exclusion criteria.
- *Suggestions:* Explaining why a cross-sectional design over others, fleshing out the accidental sampling process (e.g., how students were recruited), and noting the cultural adaptation to Mexican Spanish would make it airtight.

4. Procedure

- *Strengths:* The translation/back-translation process with experts, pilot phase ($n = 50$), standardization via manual and website, and data cleaning (843 to 772) are all impressive, with ethical standards met (informed consent).
- *Suggestions:* Specify modifications to the translation/pilot (e.g., adjusted items), detail criteria for removing missing data, and clarify and describe the monitoring during implementation. Once the procedure is translated into Mexican Spanish, what modifications were requested by the experts? Similarly, in the pilot phase, what modifications were made based on the results, and what is the justification for those modifications? The main objective of the study will be to ensure that these modifications made during the preliminary phases will serve as the basis for the final version of the instrument that will be subjected to scrutiny.
- To calculate the sample, it is mentioned that the criteria proposed by Nunnally, Thorndike, and Martínez Arias were used, which range from 5 to 10 patients per item, where it is mentioned that they used a formula $N = 10K$ where k represents the number of items in the instrument, considering then that there are 90 items, a minimum sample of 900 should be met. At the end, it is mentioned that the statistical studies are carried out with a sample of 772 students, so it is necessary to explain and justify the decision. How can that sample affect your results?
- Improve transparency and replicability. It will often be difficult to include samples with a sufficient number of patients for this type of study, so it is important to clarify whether a different convenience

sample was used, as this description provides methodological value for those interested in replicating the methodology in future studies.

5. Statistical Analysis

- *Strengths:* A comprehensive toolkit—descriptive stats, Kolmogorov-Smirnov, t-tests, Cronbach’s alpha, EFA, and CFA with SEM—powered by fitting software (SPSS, Amos 21) makes this robust.
- *Suggestions:* Spell out how non-normality was handled, pin down EFA/CFA criteria (e.g., rotation, fit indices), clarify sociodemographic roles, and fix “Kolmogorov” to “Kolmogorov” for polish.

6. Results (Sample Characteristics & Psychometric Properties)

- *Strengths:* The sample breakdown (67% female, mean age 21.33, 7 states) and psychometrics (17 factors, 65.226% variance, $\alpha = 0.959$, CFA with RMSEA = 0.042) are clear, backed by tidy tables (1-4).
- *Suggestions:* Explain dropping normally distributed items, name “Unrelenting Standards” as the missing EMS, address outlier handling, and unpack the CFA’s moderate fit (CFI = 0.881) to tie it to theory.

7. Discussion

- *Strengths:* Ties findings to global and local research, digs into the CFA’s mixed fit (great RMSEA, so-so CFI), and thoughtfully tackles limitations (sample biases) and the missing EMS with cultural guesses.
- *Suggestions:* Dive deeper into why “Unrelenting Standards” didn’t show (e.g., cultural overlap?), explore the moderate CFA fit, and link limitations to specific outcomes for a tighter narrative.

8. Statements and Declarations

- *Strengths:* Straightforwardly states no conflicts of interest or external funding, meeting ethical transparency expectations.
- *Suggestions:* Smooth out the wording (e.g., “no competing interests”), and if applicable, add a nod to ethical approval for completeness.

9. References

- *Strengths:* A hefty 43 citations cover Schema Therapy classics (Young), international validations, and SEM standards (Hu & Bentler), grounding the study solidly.
- *Suggestions:* Fix “Dziub” to “Dziuban,” standardize “and” vs. “y,” update URLs, and maybe add a Mexican cultural reference for “Unrelenting Standards” context.

Final Thoughts:

I sincerely commend the authors for crafting a culturally relevant psychometric tool. The YSQ-S3-MX could genuinely enhance assessment and treatment for Mexican students, and my feedback aims to help it reach its full potential. I'm happy to assist further with any adjustments or questions—just let me know!

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.