




# Psychometric Network Analysis of Anhedonia and Reward Responsivity in Adolescents with Subclinical Depression

Ploy. Chantarasiri<sup>1</sup>, Rachid. El Amrani<sup>2\*</sup>, Yu-Chen. Lin<sup>3</sup>


<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Department of Social Psychology, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco



<sup>3</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan

\* Corresponding author email address: rachid.elamrani@um5.ac.ma

## Editor

Anela Hasanagic  
Full Professor, Department of  
Psychology, Faculty of Islamic  
Education, University of Zenica,  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Seyed Ali Darbani  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran  
Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.  
Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph describing the forward-backward translation procedure lacks detail. Please specify whether cultural adaptation procedures (e.g., cognitive interviewing, item modification) were implemented beyond linguistic translation. Additionally, report whether confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to verify factorial equivalence in the Moroccan sample.

In the paragraph beginning “A Gaussian Graphical Model (GGM) was estimated...”, the authors assume multivariate normality. Given Likert-scale ordinal data, please justify the use of GGM instead of a nonparanormal transformation or polychoric correlation-based network estimation.

The statement “Bootstrapped confidence intervals indicated acceptable edge stability” lacks quantitative detail. Please provide a supplementary figure of bootstrapped edge weight confidence intervals and explicitly report the CS-coefficient for strength, closeness, and betweenness.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

*1.2. Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

Table 2 presents “composite node clusters representing core symptom domains”. However, earlier in the Data Analysis section it is stated that “items from the SHAPS, TEPS, and BAS Reward Responsiveness subscale were treated as nodes.” Please clarify whether the network was estimated at the item level or domain level. This inconsistency affects interpretability of centrality metrics.

In Table 3, “Reduced Anticipatory Excitement” is described as having the highest strength centrality ( $z = 1.34$ ). Please provide the raw strength value in addition to z-scores and clarify whether z-standardization was performed across all nodes. Also indicate whether centrality difference tests were conducted to determine statistical differences between nodes.

The manuscript interprets betweenness values as clinically meaningful. Given methodological literature cautioning against overinterpretation of betweenness in psychological networks due to instability, please report the correlation stability coefficient for betweenness specifically.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

**2. Revised**

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.