S. Table 1

*Fit indices of the confirmatory factor analyses per country*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Satorra-Bentler χ² | | | CFI | AIC | RMSEA [90% CI] | SRMR | Comparison |
|  | *χ²a* | *df* | *p* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total sample (N = 7141) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 13745.80 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.852 | 563250.51 | 0.056 [0.055, 0.056] | 0.059 |  |
| Seven factors | 10346.61 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.891 | 558599.43 | 0.048 [0.047, 0.049] | 0.057 |  |
| Eleven factors | 9071.42 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.905 | 556873.87 | 0.045 [0.044, 0.045] | 0.055 |  |
| Canada (n = 277) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1361.273 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.844 | 21604.010 | 0.059 [0.054, 0.065] | 0.095 |  |
| Seven factors | 1222.696 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.882 | 21420.449 | 0.052 [0.046, 0.057] | 0.095 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1180.376 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.894 | 21358.17 | 0.049 [0.043, 0.055] | 0.094 |  |
| Colombia (n = 607) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 2092.546 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0. 841 | 54854.173 | 0.057 [0.054, 0.060] | 0.069 |  |
| Seven factors | 1881.718 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0. 866 | 54606.740 | 0.052 [0.049, 0.055] | 0.064 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1814.231 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.874 | 54527.587 | 0.051 [0.047, 0.054] | 0.063 |  |
| France (n = 681) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1700.312 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.814 | 44692.844 | 0.046 [0.043, 0.049] | 0.056 |  |
| Seven factors | 1548.581 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.846 | 44502.110 | 0.042 [0.039, 0.045] | 0.056 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1398.918 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.877 | 44319.230 | 0.038 [0.034, 0.041] | 0.055 |  |
| Germany (n = 1225) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3 |
| Three factors | 3569.662 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.824 | 85533.261 | 0.062 [0.060, 0.064] | 0.067 |  |
| Seven factors | 2605.723 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.877 | 84244.208 | 0.050 [0.048, 0.052] | 0.063 |  |
| Eleven factors | 2359.182 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.900 | 83909.756 | 0.047 [0.045, 0.049] | 0.062 |  |
| Ghana (n = 185) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7<3\* |
| Three factors | 1124.075 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.824 | 16935.506 | 0.050 [0.043, 0.057] | 0.072 |  |
| Seven factors | 1095.077 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.838 | 16907.192 | 0.048 [0.041, 0.056] | 0.069 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1065.601 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.855 | 16869.597 | 0.046 [0.038, 0.053] | 0.069 |  |
| India (n = 553) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1545.216 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.889 | 51290.078 | 0.045 [0.041, 0.048] | 0.053 |  |
| Seven factors | 1402.232 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.910 | 51124.317 | 0.040 [0.037, 0.044] | 0.050 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1376.583 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.913 | 51098.604 | 0.040 [0.036, 0.043] | 0.049 |  |
| Indonesia (n = 568) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1926.944 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.818 | 46218.058 | 0.055 [0.052, 0.058] | 0.061 |  |
| Seven factors | 1700.388 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.856 | 45929.745 | 0.049 [0.046, 0.052] | 0.058 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1615.932 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.869 | 45827.958 | 0.047 [0.043, 0.050] | 0.057 |  |
| Mexico (n = 559) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1933.630 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.845 | 51062.681 | 0.055 [0.052, 0.058] | 0.075 |  |
| Seven factors | 1697.024 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.877 | 50786.863 | 0.049 [0.046, 0.052] | 0.072 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1617.886 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.887 | 50696.168 | 0.047 [0.044, 0.050] | 0.070 |  |
| The Netherlands, healthy sample (n = 810) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 2080.430 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.714 | 45260.571 | 0.054 [0.051, 0.057] | 0.063 |  |
| Seven factors | 1701.603 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.800 | 44704.025 | 0.046 [0.043, 0.049] | 0.060 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1498.866 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.846 | 44410.514 | 0.040 [0.037, 0.043] | 0.057 |  |
| The Netherlands, schizophrenia sample (n = 844) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 2573.253 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.742 | 69395.293 | 0.060 [0.058, 0.063] | 0.064 |  |
| Seven factors | 2087.071 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.813 | 68788.005 | 0.051 [0.049, 0.054] | 0.064 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1708.645 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.869 | 68308.541 | 0.043 [0.040, 0.046] | 0.062 |  |
| Spain (n = 658) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1790.892 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.732 | 34439.824 | 0.057 [0.053, 0.060] | 0.077 |  |
| Seven factors | 1431.201 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.835 | 33726.645 | 0.045 [0.041, 0.048] | 0.072 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1315.977 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.865 | 33535.749 | 0.040 [0.036, 0.044] | 0.070 |  |
| Sweden (n = 839) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 2140.723 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.783 | 53721.139 | 0.055 [0.052, 0.058] | 0.067 |  |
| Seven factors | 1691.758 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.859 | 52975.155 | 0.044 [0.042, 0.047] | 0.063 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1573.445 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.877 | 52795.738 | 0.041 [0.038, 0.045] | 0.060 |  |
| The United Kingdom (n = 257) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7<3\*+ |
| Three factors | 1468.208 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.842 | 19142.817 | 0.068 [0.062, 0.073] | 0.096 |  |
| Seven factors | 1323.803 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.875 | 18955.981 | 0.061 [0.055, 0.067] | 0.096 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1221.530 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.899 | 18816.197 | 0.055 [0.048, 0.061] | 0.096 |  |
| The United States (n = 216) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11<7\*<3\* |
| Three factors | 1546.636 | 816 | < 0.01 | 0.839 | 18221.696 | 0.076 [0.070, 0.082] | 0.090 |  |
| Seven factors | 1429.889 | 810 | < 0.01 | 0.865 | 18052.097 | 0.070 [0.064, 0.076] | 0.089 |  |
| Eleven factors | 1391.336 | 808 | < 0.01 | 0.872 | 18004.740 | 0.068 [0.062, 0.074] | 0.089 |  |

*Note*. RMSEA = Robust Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. CFI = Robust Comparative Fit Index. AIC = Akaike Information Criterion. 90%CI = 90% Confidence Interval. Comparison = Nested model comparison using a Scaled Chi Square Difference Test with Satorra-Bentler formula (Satorra & Bentler, 2001). 11<7\*<3\* = Eleven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than both Seven factors and Three factors, and Seven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors. 11<7\*<3 = Eleven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than both Seven factors and Three factors, and Seven factors factorial structure was not a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors. 11<7<3\* = Eleven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors (but not Seven factors), and Seven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors. 11<7<3\*+ = Due to a negative test statistic, model fit was compared following another formula (Satorra & Bentler, 2010) showing that Eleven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors (but not Seven factors), and Seven factors factorial structure was a significantly better fit to the data than Three factors factorial structure.

S. Table 2

*Completely standardized factor loadings of the eleven factors CAPE on the total community sample (N = 7141)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Factor Loadings |
| *Positive Symptoms Factor* |
|  | *Bizarre Experiences* |
| Q5. Messages from the TV | 0.57 |
| Q17. Influenced by devices | 0.64 |
| Q24. Thought withdrawal | 0.72 |
| Q26. Thought insertation | 0.71 |
| Q28. Thought broadcasting | 0.70 |
| Q30. Thought echo | 0.71 |
| Q31. External control | 0.71 |
|  | *Hallucinations* |
| Q33. Voice Hearing | 0.80 |
| Q34. Voices Conversing | 0.82 |
| Q41. Capgras | 0.75 |
| Q42. Visual Hallucinations | 0.76 |
|  | *Paranoia* |
| Q2. Double meaning | 0.53 |
| Q6. False Appearances | 0.46 |
| Q7. Being persecuted | 0.69 |
| Q10. Conspiracy | 0.71 |
| Q22. Odd looks | 0.56 |
|  | *Grandiosity* |
| Q11. Being important | 0.78 |
| Q13. Being special | 0.72 |
|  | *Magical Thinking* |
| Q15. Telepathy | 0.70 |
| Q20. Voodoo | 0.63 |
| *Negative Symptoms Factor* | |
|  | *Social Withdrawal* |
| Q3. Lack of enthusiams | 0.60 |
| Q4. Not talkative | 0.55 |
| Q16. No interest in others | 0.63 |
| Q29. Lack of spontaneity | 0.63 |
|  | *Blunted Affect* |
| Q8. No emotion | 0.64 |
| Q27. Blunted feelings | 0.73 |
| Q32. Blunted emotions | 0.76 |
|  | *Amotivation* |
| Q18. Lack of motivation | 0.68 |
| Q21. No energy | 0.64 |
| Q23. Empty mind | 0.54 |
| Q25. Lack of activity | 0.66 |
| Q35. Lack of hygiene | 0.59 |
| Q36. Unable to terminate | 0.63 |
| Q37. Lack of hobby | 0.58 |
| *Depressive Symptoms Factor* | |
| Q1. Sad | 0.63 |
| Q9. Pessimism | 0.63 |
| Q12. No future | 0.71 |
| Q14. Not worth living | 0.67 |
| Q19. Frequently cry | 0.51 |
| Q38. Guilty | 0.56 |
| Q39. Failure | 0.74 |
| Q40. Feeling tense | 0.53 |

S.Table 3

*Measurement invariance of the CAPE between LAMIC and HIC equalized sample (N = 4944)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Robust χ² | | | CFI | Δ CFI | RMSEA | Δ RMSEA | SRMR | Δ SRMR | Decision |
|  | *χ²* | *df* | *p* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base total sample model | 17471.24 | 809 | <0.01 | 0.971 | - | 0.043 | - | 0.050 | - | - |
| Configural invariance model | 7135.18 | 1618 | <0.01 | 0.974 |  | 0.037 |  | 0.050 |  |  |
| Metric invariance model | 8956.42 | 1656 | <0.01 | 0.965 | -0.008 | 0.042 | 0.005 | 0.055 | 0.004 | Accept |
| Scalar invariance model | 10632.06 | 1687 | <0.01 | 0.958 | -0.008 | 0.047 | 0.004 | 0.058 | 0.003 | Accept |
| Partial scalar invariance model | 9035.28 | 1680 | <0.01 | 0.965 | <0.001 | 0.042 | <0.001 | 0.055 | <0.001 | Accept |
| Residual invariance model | 12234.67 | 1729 | <0.01 | 0.950 | -0.008 | 0.050 | 0.003 | 0.068 | 0.010 | Accept |
| Partial residual invariance model | 10623.55 | 1722 | <0.01 | 0.958 | <0.001 | 0.046 | -0.001 | 0.065 | 0.007 | Accept |

*Note*. LAMIC = Low-and-Middle Income-Countries (*n* = 2472). HIC = High Income-Countries (*n* = 2472). CFI = Robust Comparative Fit Index. RMSEA = Robust Root Mean Square Error of Approximation. SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. HIC original sample (*n* = 4575) was randomly excluded to match the number of LAMIC sample. Metric invariance model was compared with configural invariance model. Scalar and partial scalar invariance model was compared with metric invariance model. Residual and partial residual invariance model was compared with scalar invariance model.