

Cross-cultural validation of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2) in 42 countries and 26 languages

Jesús Castro-Calvo¹, Patricia Beltrán-Martínez¹, Rafael Ballester-Arnal^{2,*}, Léna Nagy^{3,4},
 Mónika Koós⁴, Shane W. Kraus⁵, Zsolt Demetrovics^{4,6}, Marc N. Potenza^{7,8}, Dominik
 Batthyány⁹, Sophie Bergeron¹⁰, Joël Billieux^{11,12}, Peer Briken¹³, Julius Burkauskas¹⁴,
 Georgina Cárdenas-López¹⁵, Joana Carvalho¹⁶, Lijun Chen¹⁷, Giacomo Ciocca¹⁸, Ornella
 Corazza^{19,20}, Rita Csako²¹, David P. Fernandez²², Elaine F. Fernandez²³, Hironobu
 Fujiwara^{24,25}, Johannes Fuss²⁶, Roman Gabrhelík^{27,28}, Ateret Gewirtz-Meydan²⁹, Biljana
 Gjoneska³⁰, Mateusz Gola^{31,32}, Joshua B. Grubbs^{33,34}, Hashim T. Hashim³⁵, Yi-Ping
 Hsieh³⁶, Md. Saiful Islam^{37,38}, Mustafa Ismail³⁹, Martha C. Jiménez-Martínez^{40,41}, Tanja
 Jurin⁴², Ondrej Kalina⁴³, Verena Klein⁴⁴, András Költő⁴⁵, Sang-Kyu Lee^{46,47}, Karol
 Lewczuk⁴⁸, Chung-Ying Lin^{49,50}, Christine Lochner⁵¹, Silvia López-Alvarado⁵², Kateřina
 Lukavská^{27,53}, Percy Mayta-Tristán⁵⁴, Dan J. Miller⁵⁵, Oľga Orosová⁴³, Gábor Orosz⁵⁶,
 Sungkyunkwan University's research team^{57, †}, Fernando P. Ponce⁵⁸, Gonzalo R.
 Quintana⁵⁹, Gabriel C. Quintero Garzola^{60,61}, Jano Ramos-Diaz⁶², Kévin Rigaud⁵⁶, Ann
 Rousseau⁶³, Marco De Tubino Scanavino^{64,65}, Marion K. Schulmeyer⁶⁶, Pratap Sharan⁶⁷,
 Mami Shibata²⁴, Sheikh Shoib^{68,69}, Vera Sigre-Leirós¹¹, Luke Sniewski⁷⁰, Ognen
 Spasovski^{71,72}, Vesta Steibliene⁷³, Dan J. Stein⁷⁴, Aleksandar Štulhofer⁷⁵, Berk C. Ünsal^{3,4},
 Marie-Pier Vaillancourt-Morel⁷⁶, Marie Claire Van Hout⁷⁷, Beáta Bóthe⁷⁸

¹Department of Personality, Assessment, and Psychological Treatments, University of Valencia, Spain.

²Departamento de Psicología Básica, Clínica y Psicobiología, University Jaume I of Castellón, Spain.

³Doctoral School of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

⁴Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

⁵Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA.

⁶Centre of Excellence in Responsible Gaming, University of Gibraltar, Gibraltar, Gibraltar.

⁷Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA.

⁸Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling, Wethersfield, CT, USA.

⁹Institute for Behavioural Addictions, Sigmund Freud University Vienna, Austria.

¹⁰Département de psychologie, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada.

¹¹Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland.

¹²Center for Excessive Gambling, Addiction Medicine, Lausanne University Hospitals (CHUV), Lausanne, Switzerland.

¹³Institute for Sex Research, Sexual Medicine, and Forensic Psychiatry; University Medical Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf; Hamburg, Germany.

¹⁴Laboratory of Behavioral Medicine, Neuroscience Institute, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Palanga, Lithuania.

¹⁵Virtual Teaching and Cyberpsychology Laboratory, School of Psychology, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico.

¹⁶William James Center for Research, Departamento de Educação e Psicologia, Universidade de Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal.

¹⁷Department of Psychology, College of Humanity and Social Science, Fuzhou University, China.

¹⁸Section of Sexual Psychopathology, Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, and Health Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy.

¹⁹Department of Clinical, Pharmaceutical and Biological Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, United Kingdom.

²⁰Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Trento, Italy.

²¹Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.

²²Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom.

²³HELP University, Malaysia.

²⁴Department of Neuropsychiatry, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.

²⁵Decentralized Big Data Team, RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Tokyo, Japan.

²⁶Institute of Forensic Psychiatry and Sex Research, Center for Translational Neuro- and Behavioral Sciences, University of Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany.

²⁷Charles University, First Faculty of Medicine, Department of Addictology, Prague, Czech Republic.

²⁸General University Hospital in Prague, Department of Addictology, Czech Republic.

²⁹School of Social Work, Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences, University of Haifa, Israel.

³⁰Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Republic of North Macedonia.

³¹Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland.

³²Institute for Neural Computations, University of California San Diego, USA.

³³Center on Alcohol, Substance use, And Addictions University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, USA.

³⁴Department of Psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, USA.

³⁵University of Warith Al-Anbiyaa, College of Medicine, Karbala, Iraq.

³⁶Department of Social Work, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, USA.

³⁷Department of Public Health and Informatics, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka-1342, Bangladesh.

³⁸Centre for Advanced Research Excellence in Public Health, Savar, Dhaka-1342, Bangladesh.

³⁹University of Baghdad, College of Medicine, Iraq.

⁴⁰Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia.

⁴¹Grupo de Investigación Biomédica y de Patología, Colombia.

⁴²Department of Psychology, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

⁴³Department of Educational Psychology and Psychology of Health, Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice, Slovakia.

⁴⁴School of Psychology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom.

⁴⁵Health Promotion Research Centre, University of Galway, Ireland.

⁴⁶Department of Psychiatry, Hallym University Chuncheon Sacred Heart Hospital, South Korea.

⁴⁷Chuncheon Addiction Management Center, South Korea.

⁴⁸Institute of Psychology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University, Warsaw, Poland.

⁴⁹Institute of Allied Health Sciences, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan.

⁵⁰Biostatistics Consulting Center, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan.

⁵¹SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Stellenbosch University, South Africa.

⁵²University of Cuenca, Ecuador.

⁵³Charles University, Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology, Prague, Czech Republic.

⁵⁴Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Perú.

⁵⁵College of Healthcare Sciences, James Cook University, Australia.

⁵⁶Artois University, France.

⁵⁷Department of Psychology, Sungkyunkwan University, South Korea.

⁵⁸Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Talca, Chile.

⁵⁹Departamento de Psicología y Filosofía, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica, Arica y Parinacota, Chile.

⁶⁰Florida State University, Republic of Panama.

⁶¹Sistema Nacional de Investigación (SNI), SENACYT, Panama.

⁶²Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Privada del Norte, Lima, Perú.

⁶³Leuven School For Mass Communication, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

⁶⁴Department of Psychiatry, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, St. Joseph's Health Care London and London Health Sciences Centre. London, Canada.

⁶⁵Lawson Health Research Institute, London, Canada.

⁶⁶Universidad Privada de Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia.

⁶⁷Department of Psychiatry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi -110029, India.

⁶⁸Department of Psychology, Shardha University, India.

⁶⁹Department of Health Services, Srinagar, 190001 India.

⁷⁰Compassionate Inquiry, Canada.

⁷¹Faculty of Philosophy, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia.

⁷²Faculty of Philosophy, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Slovakia.

⁷³Laboratory of Behavioral Medicine, Neuroscience Institute, Lithuanian University of Health sciences, Palanga, Lithuania.

⁷⁴SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Dept of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town.

⁷⁵Department of Sociology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

⁷⁶Département de Psychologie, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, Canada.

⁷⁷Public Health Institute, Faculty of Health, Liverpool John Moores University, United Kingdom.

⁷⁸Département de Psychologie, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada.

† The Sungkyunkwan University's research team includes Dr. H. Chang and Mr. K. Park

***Correspondence author**

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Rafael Ballester Arnal, Departamento de Psicología Básica, Clínica y Psicobiología, Universitat Jaume I, Av. Vicent Sos Baynat, s/n, Castellón 12071, Spain. Email: rballest@uji.es

Funding sources

C-YL was supported by the WUN Research Development Fund (RDF) 2021 and the Higher Education Sprout Project, the Ministry of Education at the Headquarters of University Advancement at the National Cheng Kung University (NCKU). G was supported by the ANR grant of the Chaire Professeur Junior of Artois University and by the Strategic Dialogue and Management Scholarship (Phase 1 and 2). GCQG was supported by the SNI #073–2022 (SENACYT, Rep. of Panama). HF was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science, JP21H05173), Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science, 21H02849), Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science, 23K07013), and the smoking research foundation. JBG was supported by grants from the Kindbridge Research Institute, the International Center for Responsible Gaming, and the Problem Gambling Network of Ohio. KLe was supported by Sonatina grant awarded by National Science Centre, Poland, grant number: 2020/36/C/HS6/00005. KLu was supported by Charles University institutional support programme Cooperatio-Health Sciences. KR was supported by a funding from the Hauts-de-France region (France) called “Dialogue Stratégique de Gestion 2 (DSG2)”. LJC was supported by the National Social Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 19BSH117). LN was supported by the ÚNKP-22-3 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. MK was supported by the ÚNKP-22-3 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. RC was supported by Auckland University of technology, 2021 Faculty Research Development Fund. RG was supported by Charles

University institutional support programme Cooperatio-Health Sciences. SB was supported by a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair. SU's research team was supported by Brain Korea 21 (BK21) program of National Research Foundation of Korea. SWK was supported by the Kindbridge Research Institute. ZD was supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development, and Innovation Office (Grant numbers: KKP126835).

Authors' contribution

Conceptualization: JC-C, PB-M, RB-A, LN, MK, SWK, ZD, MNP, and BB.

Data curation: JC-C, PB-M, RB-A, LN, MK, SWK, ZD, MNP, DB, SB, JBi, PB, JBu, GC-L, JC, LC, GC, OC, RC, DPF, EFF, HF, JF, RG, AG-M, BG, MG, JBG, HTH, Y-PH, MSI, MI, MCJ-M, TJ, OK, VK, AK, S-KL, KLe, C-YL, CL, SL-A, KLu, PM-T, DJM, OO, GO, SU' research team, FPP, GRQ, GCQG, JR-D, KR, AR, MDTs, MKS, PS, MS, SS, VS-L, LS, OS, VS, DJS, AŠ, BCÜ, M-PV-M, MCVH, and BB.

Formal analysis: JC-C and PB-M.

Funding acquisition: LN, MK, ZD, HF, RG, C-YL, CL, and BB.

Investigation: JC-C, PB-M, RB-A, LN, MK, SWK, ZD, MNP, DB, SB, JBi, PB, JBu, GC-L, JC, LC, GC, OC, RC, DPF, EFF, HF, JF, RG, AG-M, BG, MG, JBG, HTH, Y-PH, MSI, MI, MCJ-M, TJ, OK, VK, AK, S-KL, KLe, C-YL, CL, SL-A, KLu, PM-T, DJM, OO, GO, SU' research team, FPP, GRQ, GCQG, JR-D, KR, AR, MDTs, MKS, PS, MS, SS, VS-L, LS, OS, VS, DJS, AŠ, BCÜ, M-PV-M, MCVH, and BB.

Methodology: JC-C, PB-M, and RB-A.

Project administration: LN, MK, and BB.

Resources: JC-C, PB-M, RB-A, JR-D, and BB.

Supervision: JC-C, RB-A, and BB.

Validation: JC-C, RB-A, and BB.

Visualization: JC-C and PB-M.

Writing-original draft: JC-C and PB-M.

Writing-review & editing: JC-C, PB-M, RB-A, JBi, DPF, RG, JBG, Y-PH, MSI, MCJ-M, C-YL, CL, KLu, PM-T, GO, FPP, GRQ, VS-L, LS, AŠ, and BB.

Conflict of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest with respect to the content of this manuscript. SWK discloses that he has received funding from the International Center for Responsible Gaming, MGM Resorts International, Center for the Application of Substance Abuse Technologies, Taylor Francis, Springer Nature, The Nevada Problem Gambling Project, Sports Betting Alliance, and Kindbridge Research Institute. MNP discloses that he has consulted for and advised Game Day Data, Addiction Policy Forum, AXA, Idorsia, Baria-Tek, and Opiant Therapeutics; been involved in a patent application with Yale University and Novartis; received research support from the Mohegan Sun Casino and the Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling; consulted for or advised legal and gambling entities on issues related to impulse control and addictive behaviors; provided clinical care related to impulse-control and addictive behaviors; performed grant reviews; edited journals/journal sections; given academic lectures in grand rounds, CME events, and other clinical/scientific venues; and generated books or chapters for publishers of mental health texts. The University of Gibraltar receives funding from the Gibraltar Gambling Care Foundation, an independent, not-for-profit charity. ELTE Eötvös Loránd University receives funding from Szerencsejáték Ltd. (the gambling operator of the Hungarian government) to maintain a telephone helpline service for problematic gambling. However, these funding sources are not related to this study, and the funding institution had no role in the study design or the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, the writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. JBurkauskas works as a consultant at Cronos. JBillieux was supported by the WUN Research Development Fund (RDF) 2021.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Anastasia Lucic and Natasha Zippan for their help with project administration and data collection, and Abu Bakkar Siddique, Anne-Marie Menard, Clara Marincowitz, Club Sexu, Critica, Digital Ethics Center (Skaitmeninės etikos centras), Día a Día, Ed Carty, El Siglo, Jakia Akter, Jayma Jannat Juma, Kamrun Nahar Momo, Kevin Zavaleta, Laraine Murray, L’Avenir de l’Artois, La Estrella de Panamá, La Voix du Nord, Le Parisien, Lithuanian National Radio and Television (Lietuvos nacionalinis radijas ir televizija), Mahfuzul Islam, Marjia Khan Trisha, Md. Rabiul Islam, Md. Shahariar Emon, Miriam Goodridge, Most. Mariam Jamila, Nahida Bintee Mostofa, Nargees Akter, Niamh Connolly, Rafael Goyoneche, Raiyaan Tabassum Imita, Raquel Savage, Ricardo Mendoza, Saima Fariha, SOS Orienta and Colegio de Psicólogos del Perú, Stephanie Kewley, Sumaiya Hassan, Susanne Bründl, Tamim Ikram, Telex.hu, Trisha Mallick, Tushar Ahmed Emon, Wéo, and Yasmin Benoit for their help with recruitment and data collection.

Word count (without abstract, references, and tables)

6,623 Words.

Manuscript re-submission

April XXth, 2023

Abstract

Sexual desire is a complex construct with important implications for sexual functioning and well-being. In this research, we translated the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2, a widely used scale for assessing sexual desire) into 25 languages from English and used data from the International Sex Survey (ISS) to: (a) investigate its psychometric properties (i.e., factorial structure, reliability, validity, and measurement invariance) and (b) explore the expression of sexual desire across different countries, genders, and sexual orientations. A total of 82,243 participants from 42 countries completed the SDI-2, along with other sexuality-related scales. Confirmatory factor analysis supported a three-factor solution for the SDI-2 (CFI=.980; RMSEA=.060), encompassing the domains of ‘Partner-related’, ‘Attractive-person-related’, and ‘Solitary Sexual Desire’. The reliability of the total score and subscales were excellent. Likewise, correlations with other sexuality-related variables were positive yet weak-to-moderate in effect size. Measurement invariance tests supported its use across countries, languages, genders, and sexual orientations. Analysis of SDI-2 scores according to these variables supported its ability to capture group-based differences in sexual desire. In sum, the SDI-2 constitutes a psychometrically robust measure for the assessment of sexual desire in non-clinical samples with utility in large-scale cross-cultural studies.

Keywords: Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2); Validation; Assessment; Cross-cultural Studies; International Sex Survey (ISS).

INTRODUCTION

Sexual desire (libido, sexual drive, sexual motivation, sexual interest, or sexual appetite [Spector et al., 1996]) is a complex construct (Moyano et al., 2017). Spector et al. (1996) defined sexual desire as an “*interest in sexual activity*” (p. 178). The authors argued that sexual desire is primarily a cognitive variable that accounts for the amount and strength of sexual thoughts and responsiveness to sexual stimuli, not for sexual frequency itself. Other authors have conceptualized sexual desire as “*the sum of the forces that lean us toward and away from sexual behavior*” (Levine, 2003, p. 279), as a stage of the sexual response (Kaplan, 1979), or as a domain of sexual functioning (Rosen et al., 2000), emphasizing its “*preparatory*” nature (i.e., sexual desire as an early necessary step for subsequent stages of sexual behavior).

Determinants of sexual desire and challenges in studying sexual desire

As proposed by Levine (2003), sexual desire involves interactions between biological (age, hormonal levels, or physical health), psychological (mood states, sexual cognitions), and relational components (feeling desired by a potential sexual partner, engaging in exciting sexual experiences, etc.). Similarly, certain sociocultural imperatives may also influence the manifestation of desire. In this regard, factors such as gender, sexual orientation, and cultural contexts may impact sexual desire. Regarding gender, differences in sexual desire have been reported between men and women (Petersen & Hyde, 2010). Historically, men have displayed stronger sexual desires than women. A recent meta-analytic review found that men more often think and fantasize about sex and more often experience sexual desire than women (Frankenbach et al., 2022). However, most studies rely on self-reported measures of sexual desire, which can be influenced by stereotypes, desirability biases, and gendered cultural scripts (Rubin et al., 2019).

Sexual orientation may also influence the expression of sexual desire (Chadwick et al., 2017). A recent study comparing sexual desire in sexually diverse and gender-diverse individuals versus heterosexual cisgender ones (Makarenko et al., 2022) found that the former reported significantly higher solitary desire. These differences seem quantitative in nature, as the structure of sexual desire (i.e., its major subcomponents) also emerge in sexually diverse samples (Mark et al., 2017). However, the limited number of empirical studies addressing the association between sexual orientation and sexual desire (in particular, those extending beyond heterosexual, bisexual, and gay/lesbian) limits the drawing of definitive conclusions.

Cultural contexts may impact sexual desire (Hatfield & Rapson, 2006). For example, Woo et al. (2011) reported higher sexual desire among White versus East Asian women. Rubin et al. (2019) recently examined the impact of gender scripts on sexual desire in heterosexual women from four countries: the United States, Canada, Germany, and Denmark. The results indicated that participants from Germany reported significantly lower levels of sexual desire, followed by participants from Denmark, Canada, and the United States. These studies suggest possible cultural biases in the expression of sexual desire, but the limited number of countries compared and the non-inclusion of male and gender-diverse samples limit the understanding of these jurisdictional differences.

The assessment of sexual desire

Popular scales for assessing sexual desire include the: (a) Hurlbert Index of Sexual Desire (HISD, Apt & Hurlbert, 1992), (b) Sexual Desire Inventory-2 (SDI-2, Spector et al., 1996), (c) Sexual Interest and Desire Inventory–Female (SIDI-F, Clayton et al., 2006), (d) Sexual Arousal and Desire Inventory (SADI, Toledano & Pfaus, 2006), and (e) Female

Sexual Desire Questionnaire (FSDQ, Goldhammer & McCabe, 2011). Given its robust psychometric properties for the assessment of both partnered and individual sexual desire and promising cross-cultural results to date, the SDI-2 may be the most popular scale for assessing sexual desire (Cartagena-Ramos et al., 2018).

The SDI-2 is a self-report measure for assessing sexual desire in multiple contexts (Cartagena-Ramos et al., 2018). During the development of the SDI-2, Spector et al. (1996) conducted two studies, one focused on item development and refinement and the other aiming to assess the scale's psychometric properties. Data suggest two SDI-2 dimensions: dyadic sexual desire (i.e., sexual desire experienced towards a partner) and solitary sexual desire (i.e., the desire to engage in sexual activities with oneself, such as masturbatory behaviors). This distinction reflects the multifaceted nature of sexual desire. The SDI-2 shows strong psychometric properties as evidenced by the internal consistency of both the dyadic ($\alpha=.86$) and solitary ($\alpha=.96$) scales and a test-retest reliability of $r=.76$ over a one-month period (Spector et al., 1996). Regarding validity, higher scores on the SDI-2 are associated with sexual desire as measured by other well-established scales (e.g., the HISD), sexual satisfaction, positive intimate and exploratory sexual cognitions, sexual excitation, frequency of sexual intercourse, and various motives for using cybersex; on the contrary, lower scores on the SDI-2 are related to increased sexual inhibition (Brahim et al., 2019; King & Allgeier, 2000; Mark et al., 2017; Moyano et al., 2017; Peixoto et al., 2020). Previous studies have demonstrated the SDI-2's robustness across diverse samples, including different languages. In particular, the SDI-2 has been translated and validated into Spanish (Ortega et al., 2006), Italian (Callea & Rossi, 2021), Portuguese (Peixoto et al., 2020), and German (Kuhn et al., 2014).

An important limitation of the SDI-2 is the lack of an unequivocal factorial solution. The original factorial solution suggests the existence of two correlated factors (i.e., dyadic and solitary sexual desire) (Spector et al., 1996). Other researchers have replicated the same two-factor solution, but including two items that were discarded from the original version (Brahim et al., 2019; Callea & Rossi, 2021; Conaglen & Evans, 2006; Heiman et al., 2011; King & Allgeier, 2000). Recently, some authors have proposed a three-factor solution for the SDI-2 in which the factor of dyadic sexual desire is divided into two subscales: one related to sexual desire towards a stable partner and the other focused on sexual desire towards an attractive person (Moyano et al., 2017). To date, studies with large and diverse samples have not evaluated the appropriateness of these potential factorial solutions. Undertaking such a study would provide valuable insights into the structure of sexual desire and how it manifests across diverse populations.

The present study

In this study, we translated the SDI-2 into 25 languages from English through a sound translation procedure and used data from the International Sex Survey (with ~82,000 participants from 42 countries [Bothe et al., 2021]) to investigate its psychometric properties (i.e., factorial structure, reliability, validity, and measurement invariance). Furthermore, we addressed a main gap in understanding by examining the SDI-2 in different countries, languages, genders, and sexual orientations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants and procedure

Study participants were drawn from the International Sex Survey (ISS), a pre-registered investigation aiming to provide cross-jurisdictional data on different aspects of sexuality (https://osf.io/xcgzf?view_only=6e4f96b748be42d99363d58e32d511b8) (for a

complete description of the study protocol, see Bothe et al., 2021). Regarding its methodology, the ISS is a cross-sectional, self-report study conducted online in 42 countries¹. Each country administered the study survey in its own language. To manage this multilingual approach, the original English version of the survey was translated into the 25 additional languages involved in the ISS project following a pre-established, robust translation procedure for cross-cultural studies (Beaton et al., 2000). In brief, collaborators from each country managed the translation of the survey from English to their native language by, at least, two independent translators (one familiar with the research topic, the other naïve). These independent translations were joined together into a single translation, solving potential discrepancies by consensus. The resulting translation was then back-translated into English by two new native translators and compared with the original version (identifying gross inconsistencies or conceptual errors in the translation). An expert committee, comprised by the investigators from each country, the translators involved in the process, and other members (e.g., methodologists, mental health professionals, etc.), consolidated the assessment battery and achieved semantic, idiomatic, experiential, and conceptual equivalence between the source and the target version. Finally, the resulting version was administered to a reduced group of participants (approximately 3-4 per language), who provided feedback regarding the clarity, understandability, and face validity

¹ Initially, Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, and Romania were included in the study protocol paper as collaborating countries (Bothe et al., 2021); however, in these countries it was not possible to get ethical approval for the study in a timely manner. Furthermore, Chile was not included in the study protocol paper as a collaborating country (Bóthe, Koós, et al., 2021) as it joined the study after publishing the study protocol. Therefore, instead of the planned 45 countries (Bóthe, Koós, et al., 2021), only 42 individual countries are considered in the present study.

of the survey. Data collection occurred between October 2021 and May 2022. The study was conducted through a secure online platform (i.e., Qualtrics). Each collaborating country advertised the study in their own context via different recruitment strategies (e.g., dissemination of the study on TV, radios and newspapers, emails through different institutions' list-servs, posting ads on different social media, or posting tear-off flyers in high-density spots, among others). Participants were eligible if they were aged 18 or older (or the legal age of a given country), were fluent in one of the multiple languages of the ISS project and gave their informed consent. The average time to complete the online survey ranged between 25-45 minutes, and participants did not receive direct compensation for participation. However, those who completed the survey were offered the possibility to choose a non-profit sexual health organization that would then receive 50 USD cents donated by the researchers (up to a total of 1,000 USD of donation), as described in the study protocol (Bothe et al., 2021).

After data cleaning (<https://osf.io/qg8c4>), data from 82,243 participants ($M_{\text{age}}=32.39$; $SD=12.52$) were analyzed. Table 1 shows participants' characteristics. For further information on the age distribution on the entire sample and by country, see Figure S1 and Table S1. Around 7% of participants ($n=5,640$) belonged to an ethnic minority group in their country. Most participants (59.57%; $n=48,987$) were female, and 40.43% ($n=33,245$) were male (i.e., sex assigned at birth). Regarding gender, 57.02% of the sample ($n=46,874$) identified as women, 39.59% ($n=32,549$) as men, and 3.38% ($n=2,783$) as gender-diverse. The most commonly reported sexual orientation was heterosexuality (68.52%; $n=56,125$), followed by bisexuality (9.38%; $n=7,688$), and gay or lesbian sexual orientation (5.62%; $n=4,607$). Approximately one-third of the sample was either single (33.49%; $n=27,541$), in a stable relationship (33.37%; $n=27,440$) or married (29.60%;

$n=24,338$). Most participants did not have children (70.64%; $n=57,909$). Most participants reported having completed tertiary education (74.06%; $n=60,896$) and working full-time (52.27%; $n=42,981$). Most participants lived in a city or metropolis (68.5%; $n=56,361$) and reported having better life circumstances than average (61.11%; $n=50,260$).

INSERT TABLE 1

The study procedures were conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Each collaborating country obtained ethical approval from their Institutional Review Boards (https://osf.io/e93kf?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5).

Measures

Participants' characteristics and sexuality-related information

Participants reported basic sociodemographic information including: (a) age, (b) country of residence, (c) language, (d) ethnic minority status (“*Do you belong to any ethnic minority groups in your country?*”), (e) sex assigned at birth (male or female), (f) gender (multiple response options summarized into three categories [men, women, or gender-diverse]), (g) sexual orientation (multiple response options summarized into eight categories [heterosexual, gay or lesbian, bisexual, queer and pansexual, homo- and hetero-flexible, asexual, questioning sexual orientation, or other]), (h) educational level, (i) work status, (j) socioeconomic status, (k) relationship status, and (l) number of children.

Sexuality-related questions included: (a) lifetime number of sexual partners (open numerical answer), (b) past-year number of casual sexual partners (open numerical answer), (c) past-year frequency of sexual activity with casual partners (from 0 [“*Never*”] to 10 [“*More than 7 times a week*”]), (d) past-year frequency of sexual activity (irrespective of the type of sexual partner; from 0 [“*Never*”] to 10 [“*More than 7 times a week*”]), (e) lifetime masturbation (yes/no), (f) past-year frequency of masturbation (from 0 [“*Never*”] to

10 [*“More than 7 times a week”*]), (g) lifetime pornography use (yes/no), and (h) past-year frequency of pornography use (from 0 [*“Never”*] to 10 [*“More than 7 times a week”*]) (Bothe et al., 2021).

Physical, mental, and sexual health conditions

Current physical, mental, and sexual health status was assessed using an *ad hoc* scale. For each aspect, participants answered the following questions: (a) presence of the condition (*“Are you suffering from [any mental illness or emotional problems (e.g., anxiety, depression, ADHD, etc.)?]”*) and [*any physical illness (e.g., high blood pressure, diabetes, cancer, etc.)?]”*) and [*any sexual problems?]”*); (b) medication (*“Do you take any medication for this illness/problem?”* [the same question for each domain]); and (c) sexuality-related side effects (*“Do you experience any side effects related to your sexuality?”* [the same question for physical and mental health status; however, side effects for sexual health were explored in general]) (Bothe et al., 2021).

Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2, Spector et al., 1996)

The SDI-2 is a 14-item self-administered questionnaire measuring sexual desire, defined by the authors as a multidimensional construct involving different domains that converge into *“the interest in behaving sexually”* (Spector et al., 1996, p. 176). To capture the multidimensional nature of sexual desire, the SDI-2 includes items exploring interest in dyadic sexual behavior (e.g., *“How strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner?”*), interest in individual sexual behavior (e.g., *“How strong is your desire to engage in sexual behavior by yourself?”*), sexual cognitions and fantasies (e.g., *“During the last month, how often have you had sexual thoughts involving a partner?”*), desire activated by external triggers (e.g., *“When you first see an attractive person, how strong is your sexual desire?”*), self-perceived sexual desire compared to others (e.g., *“Compared to other*

people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually by yourself?”), and distress experienced during abstinence from sexual experience (e.g., *“How long could you go comfortably without having sexual activity of some kind?”*). These items were drawn from well-established theoretical models of sexual desire, diagnostic criteria for the diagnosis of hypoactive sexual desire according to the DSM-III-R, and clinical experience from the original authors of the scale, and then validated by a panel of sexology researchers and clinicians. Before completing the SDI-2, respondents were presented with a definition of sexual desire² to promote a common understanding of its meaning. Most items were rated on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 8, whereas the three items assessing frequency (i.e., items beginning by *“how often”*) were rated on an 8-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 7. Thus, the total score ranged between 0 and 101³. The response categories differed according to the type of question, including ratings of strength (from *“No desire”* to *“Strong desire”*), relevance (from *“Not at all important”* to *“Extremely important”*), and frequency (from *“Not at all”* to *“More than once a day”*).

Data analysis

All analyses were pre-registered (<https://osf.io/qg8c4>) and followed a five-step analytical plan. This plan included the following: (1) descriptive statistics; (2) dimensionality tests (in particular, confirmatory factor analysis [CFA]); (3) reliability tests

² Text presented to respondents before completing the SDI-2: *“This questionnaire asks about your level of sexual desire. By desire, we mean interest in or wish for sexual activity”*.

³ Following the same approach as in most of the studies using the SDI-2 (Peixoto et al., 2020), Item 14 was excluded from the calculus of its total score and from the estimation of its factorial structure. The reason is that this item assesses self-perception of being comfortable without having sexual activity, rather than sexual desire itself. Item 14 was retained in the ISS survey to keep the integrity of the scale.

(i.e., Cronbach's alpha [α] and McDonald's omega [ω]); (4) measurement invariance (in particular, multi-group CFAs according to four variables of interest [country, language, gender, and sexual orientation]); and (5) validity tests. Analytic software included SPSS statistical package (version 28) and R (version 4.1.3). Missing values on the SDI-2 ranged between 0.1%-0.4% (i.e., almost negligible) and were not missing completely at random according to Little's Missing Completely at Random Test (MCAR) ($\chi^2=3207.22$, $df=2085$, $p<.001$) (Little, 1988). Although the preregistered analytic approach planned the use of the Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) method to handle missing values, this was not available in lavaan's CFA function. Instead, as the rate of missing data was almost negligible, we used lavaan's default listwise deletion method.

Descriptive statistics

In a first step, descriptive statistics of the SDI-2 items and total score (i.e., range, mean, and standard deviation) were computed. Skewness and kurtosis were inspected to assess the normality/non-normality of distribution. Average SDI-2 total scores according to the country, language, gender, and sexual orientation were reported. To investigate whether scores on sexual desire differed according to these variables, we conducted one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs). Effect sizes were assessed by partial eta squared (η^2), and then transformed to Cohen's f using G*Power (Lakens, 2013). For Cohen's f , effect sizes of about 0.10 were considered small, close to 0.25 moderate, and greater than 0.40 large (Cohen, 1988).

Dimensionality tests

CFAs were conducted on the total sample to check the goodness of fit of three competing factorial solutions for the SDI-2. These three competing models are the most common factorial solutions for the SDI-2 in the literature. The first model, proposed by the

original authors of the scale (Spector et al., 1996), argues for a two-factor solution comprising a subscale of dyadic sexual desire (Items 1-8) and another of solitary sexual desire (Items 10-12). In this model, Items 9 and 13 are excluded as they measure self-perceived sexual desire in comparison to others (in the authors' opinion, a slightly different construct). Despite the original factorial solution dismissing these two items, subsequent studies retained them in the calculus of the two subscales (Item 9 in the dyadic sexual desire factor and Item 13 in the solitary sexual desire factor) (Peixoto et al., 2020). This factorial solution was also tested through CFA (model 2). Recently, other authors have found empirical evidence supporting a three-factor solution (Moyano et al., 2017). This model retains the classical solitary sexual desire factor (Items 10-13) but divides the dyadic sexual desire factor into two subscales (i.e., "attractive person-related sexual desire" [Items 4-5] and "partner-related sexual desire" [Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9]). This was the third factorial solution tested in this study (model 3).

The lavaan package in R was used to conduct CFAs (Rosseel, 2012). Given its superiority to other estimation methods for ordered-categorical items such in the case of the SDI-2 (Finney & DiStefano, 2013), the estimation method used to conduct these CFAs was the Weighted Least Squares Mean and Variance Adjusted (WLSMV). Goodness of fit for the CFAs was assessed through the following indices: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). WLSMV-based Chi-Square (χ^2) and the general model significance (p) were also reported. Given that these statistics are highly conditioned by sample size (Markland, 2007), we did not use them to assess models fit. Following the pre-registration guidelines, excellent model fit was considered when the CFI and TLI were $\geq .95$ and RMSEA $\leq .05$ (Bagozzi & Yi, 2011; Schermelleh-Engel & Müller, 2003). Using less restrictive criteria, values $\geq .90$

for the CFI and TLI and $\leq .08$ for the RMSEA were considered acceptable (Hooper et al., 2008).

Reliability tests

Internal consistency was assessed through the Ordinal Cronbach's alpha (α) and the McDonald's Omega (ω). These indices were calculated using the R package Psych (Revelle, 2023). According to the criterion proposed by Hunsley & Mash (2008), an internal consistency between .70 and .79 was considered appropriate, between .80 and .89 good, and $\geq .90$ excellent.

Measurement invariance

To assess whether the factor structure of the SDI-2 was valid for use across different languages, countries, genders, and sexual orientations, we conducted multi-group CFAs. Specifically, we tested six levels of invariance: (1) configural invariance (test whether items loaded on the same factor across groups), (2) metric invariance (test whether item factorial loadings were equal across groups), (3) scalar invariance (test whether item intercepts were equal across groups), (4) residual invariance (test whether items measurement error were equal across groups); (5) latent variance-covariance invariance (test whether factors' latent variance and covariance were equal across groups), and (6) latent mean invariance (test whether factors' latent mean was equal across groups). The first four levels examined the presence of potential measurement biases (namely, measurement invariance), while the last two levels examined the presence of group-based differences on the level of variance, covariance, and means (namely, structural invariance) (Milfont & Fischer, 2010; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

To determine the minimum number of participants required to include a particular subgroup in these analyses, we conducted a Monte Carlo simulation before starting data

analysis (<https://osf.io/qg8c4>). Given the metric characteristics of the SDI-2 and the type of factorial structure to be tested, the Monte Carlo simulation concluded that 385 was the minimum number of participants per subgroup to be included in the invariance tests. After applying this threshold, a total of 22 languages (out of 26), 35 countries (out of 42), 3 genders (out of 3), and 8 sexual orientation subgroups (out of 8) were included in the invariance tests. The extremely large number of subgroups in the analyses according to country precluded conducting invariance tests integrating all countries within the same dataset (to avoid convergence problems). To manage this issue, following the preregistered analytic plan, countries were divided into two independent datasets based on their alphabetical order (18 countries in dataset 1 [countries from 'a' to 'j'] and 17 in dataset 2 [countries from 'l' to 'u']) and invariance tests according to the country were conducted for each dataset separately.

The adequacy of the increasingly constrained nested models was assessed through the difference between pairs of nested models (Δ) in the RMSEA and CFI. A change ≥ 0.010 in the CFI and ≥ 0.015 in the RMSEA indicated a significant decrease in the model fit when testing for measurement invariance (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). For metric invariance, a less stringent criterion (i.e., ≥ 0.020 in the CFI and ≥ 0.030 in the RMSEA) was considered acceptable (Rutkowski & Svetina, 2014). Following the pre-registration plan, in the case that models were not fully invariant at the measurement level (i.e., configural, metric, scalar, and residual), we tested partial measurement invariance (i.e., models in which a subset of parameters was allowed to vary across groups) (Milfont & Fischer, 2010). The selection of the specific parameters to be freed in these analyses was

based on a previous analysis of the modification indices and the resulting changes in X^2 (conducted using the R function *lavTestScore*).

Validity tests

To test the convergent validity of the SDI-2, scores were correlated (Pearson's r) with theoretically relevant sexual variables (such as the number of sexual partners and frequency of sexual intercourse, masturbation, and pornography use). Values around $|.10|$ were considered weak, $|.30|$ moderate, and $|.50|$ strong (Cohen, 1992).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics of the SDI-2 items and total score are presented in Table 2. All SDI-2 items were normally distributed, as illustrated by skewness and kurtosis scores ranging between $-1.00 - 0.13$ and $-1.06 - 0.35$, respectively.

INSERT TABLE 2

Factorial structure and reliability

To assess the factorial structure of the SDI-2, we compared the adequacy of three different solutions through CFA on the total sample. Goodness-of-fit indices from the tested models are presented in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3

As Table 3 shows, the factorial solution with the most satisfactory fit indices was model 3 (i.e., the three-factor solution). This model showed an excellent fit to the data (CFI=.980; TLI=.975; RMSEA=.060 [90% CI=.059 to .060]). Standardized factor loadings ranged between $.63-.91$ (i.e., above the threshold to consider them appropriate [Howard, 2016]). Regarding internal consistency, ordinal Cronbach's α and ω for all SDI-2 factors (between $.88-.92$) and its total score (between $.89-.94$) exceeded the criterion established by

Hunsley and Mash (2008) to consider the reliability excellent. Furthermore, notable convergence occurred between both indices, an aspect that may be considered a good indicator of the internal consistency of the SDI-2 under different conditions (Zinbarg et al., 2005). The inter-factor correlations were positive yet moderate (from .38 to .43).

Measurement invariance

To test measurement and structural invariance of the SDI-2 according to language, country, gender, and sexual orientation, we conducted multi-group CFAs using the three-factor solution. Table S2 displays results from the language-based invariance tests. Configural invariance according to language was supported (CFI=.978; TLI=.972; RMSEA=.064 [90% CI=.063 to .065]), so we subsequently estimated models with increasing levels of constraints to test higher levels of invariance. Regarding metric invariance, changes in the RMSEA and CFI did not show a significant worsening in the model fit (Δ CFI=0.001; Δ RMSEA=0.008), thus supporting a complete equivalence of the SDI-2 factorial solution and factorial loadings according to language. However, the significant Δ in CFI and RMSEA at a scalar level (0.017 and 0.011, respectively) suggested the presence of differences at this measurement level according to language. Therefore, based on modification indices, we conducted partial scalar invariance by relaxing the equality constraint on the residual variance of Item 1 in Spanish–Spain and 8 and 12 in Italian, resulting in an appropriate model fit (Δ CFI=0.010; Δ RMSEA=0.006). The last level of invariance achieved was at a partial residual level (Δ CFI=0.006; Δ RMSEA=0.003), thus reflecting lack of measurement biases according to language. However, latent variance-covariance and latent mean invariance were not met. To further explore this issue, average total scores on the SDI-2 according to language were estimated.

We observed significant small-to-moderate differences according to language ($F [21]=175,57; p<.001; \eta^2=.044; f=0.21$) (see details in Table S3).

Subsequently, we conducted measurement invariance tests according to country in two independent datasets (Table S4; see “Data analysis” for the rationale behind the use of two independent datasets). In dataset 1, full configural (CFI=.976; TLI=.969; RMSEA=.065 [90% CI=.064 to .066]) and metric invariance (Δ CFI=0.015; Δ RMSEA=0.011) were achieved, but constraining items intercepts resulted in a significant worsening of the model fit (Δ CFI=0.024; Δ RMSEA=0.015). To address this issue, we relaxed the equality constraint of Items 1 and 2 in China and Items 8 and 12 in Israel, resulting in meeting partial scalar invariance (Δ CFI=0.009; Δ RMSEA=0.003). Finally, relaxing the equality constraints of Item 12 in Hungary let to meet partial residual invariance (Δ CFI=0.003; Δ RMSEA=0.0001). In dataset 2, full configural (CFI=.982; TLI=.977; RMSEA=.061 [90% CI=.060 to .062]), metric (Δ CFI=0.005; Δ RMSEA=0.002), and residual invariance (Δ CFI=0.006; Δ RMSEA=0.001) were achieved without relaxing any constraint. Furthermore, relaxing equality constraints of Item 12 in Hungary resulted in meeting partial scalar invariance (Δ CFI=0.008; Δ RMSEA=0.006). Latent variance-covariance and latent mean invariance were not met either in dataset 1 or 2, thus suggesting the presence of structural invariance according to country. In this regard, we observed significant small-to-moderate differences in SDI-2 total scores according to country ($F [34]=123.821; p<.001; \eta^2=.051; f=0.23$) (Table S5). Countries in the upper end of SDI-2 scores (i.e., Brazil [M=64.02], Hungary [M=62.14], and Turkey [M=61.83]) scored between 11-19 points above those in the lower end (i.e., Taiwan [M=50.29], China

[$M=49.00$], and Colombia [$M=45.31$]), thus highlighting the existence of important differences in sexual desire across countries.

Regarding gender (Table S6) and sexual orientation-based measurement invariance (Table S8), full configural, metric, scalar, and residual invariance was achieved (i.e., complete measurement invariance according to gender and sexual orientation). However, once again, latent variance-covariance and latent mean invariance were not met. According to gender and sexual orientation (Tables S7 and S9), men ($M=62.92$) and gay or lesbian individuals ($M=62.75$) obtained greater scores on the SDI-2. Differences according to gender ($F [2]=3231.65$; $p<.001$; $\eta^2=.074$; $f=0.28$) and sexual orientation ($F [7]=881.85$; $p<.001$; $\eta^2=.071$; $f=0.27$) were moderate-to-large. Notably, asexual participants scored quite low on sexual desire ($M=18.28$), reflecting that these individuals are characterized by minimal/no sexual attraction/desire.

SDI-2 Validity

As displayed in Table 4 (convergent validity), the SDI-2 showed weak-to-strong associations with theoretically relevant sexual correlates. In particular, the SDI-2 showed positive, weak correlations with the number of past-year sexual partners ($r=.11$) and lifetime number of sexual partners ($r=.13$), weak-to-moderate associations with the past-year sexual frequency with a stable partner ($r=.20$), with casual partners ($r=.22$) or in general ($r=.27$), and strong associations with past-year frequency of pornography use ($r=.47$) and past-year frequency of masturbation ($r=.56$).

INSERT TABLE 4

DISCUSSION

Sexual desire is a complex construct in which biological, psychological, and social components interact to determine the intensity of individuals' sexual interest and their

prone to behaving sexually (i.e., seeking or avoiding sexual activity) (Levine, 2003). Multiple definitions and conceptualizations of sexual desire exist, hindering the ways in which sexual desire has been measured. A widely used scale assessing sexual desire in non-clinical samples is the SDI-2 (Spector et al., 1996). Even when this scale presents excellent psychometric properties, it remains limited in several ways. An important limitation of the SDI-2 has been the lack of an unequivocal factorial solution. Another issue involves cross-cultural validity (Cartagena-Ramos et al., 2018): although sexual desire may be conditioned by cultural (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993) and gendered (Rubin et al., 2019) sexual scripts, few studies had investigated the validity of the SDI-2 in different countries and cultural contexts. Moreover, before the ISS commenced, the SDI-2 was only available in a limited number of languages (English [Spector et al., 1996], Spanish [Ortega et al., 2006] or Portuguese [Peixoto et al., 2020]). To address these issues, we translated the SDI-2 into 25 languages from English and used data from the ISS (~82,000 participants from 42 countries) to: (1) test the adequacy of three different factorial solutions, (2) explore the psychometric properties of the resulting factorial solution (both reliability and validity), (3) assess its measurement and structural invariance according to country, language, gender, and sexual orientation, and (4) examine the expression of sexual desire in different countries, languages, genders, and sexual orientations.

Regarding the factor structure of the SDI-2, our results showed the superiority of the three-factor solution over the two competing models. This finding resonates with previous ones in which an equivalent three-factor solution for the SDI-2 showed the best fit to the data (Holmberg & Blair, 2009; Mark et al., 2017; Moyano et al., 2017). This factorial structure keeps the original subscale of “solitary sexual desire,” but divides the subscale of “dyadic sexual desire” into two subcomponents: one focused on sexual desire for a stable

partner (i.e., “partner-related sexual desire”) and the other focused on sexual desire for an attractive person (i.e., “attractive person-related sexual desire”). Through this approach, the factorial structure of the SDI-2 recognizes that the psychological and sexual dynamics related to the interest toward a stable partner are different from those involved in the sexual desire for an attractive, and possibly unknown, other person (Diamond, 2003, 2004; Hatfield & Rapson, 2006). Furthermore, this division captures the experience of people displaying no sexual desire for their stable partners but showing an obvious interest for casual sex and vice versa (Sarin et al., 2013; Vowels, 2023). Supporting their view as correlated but independent components of dyadic sexual desire, the moderate association between these two subscales ($r=.43$) means that high scores on one of the subscales does not necessarily translate into high levels of sexual desire on the other. Similarly, the moderate association between the two dyadic components of sexual desire and the factor of solitary sexual desire (r between .38 and .41) supports the view of sexual desire as multidimensional (Levine, 2003), thus advising for the use of the SDI-2 according to its three subscales rather than on the basis of a total score of sexual desire (as the latter may not totally represent the intrinsic variability in sexual desire that individuals may express in different sexuality-related domains).

Regarding its psychometric properties, this study demonstrates that the SDI-2 is a reliable and valid scale for the assessment of sexual desire. Cronbach’s α and ω for the three SDI-2 subscales and for the total score ranged between .88 and .94. These values are comparable to, and in some cases higher than, those obtained in previous studies (for a review, see Mark et al., 2017). In addition, the total SDI-2 score correlated with the frequencies of pornography use and masturbation (strong association). These results resonate with previous studies showing a strong link between sexual desire and problematic

cybersex use (Brahim et al., 2019), problematic use of mobile dating apps (Rochat et al., 2019) or attitudes toward masturbation (Cervilla et al., 2021). The link between sexual desire and sexual frequency (in particular, for sexual activities involving a partner) is more complex, as engaging in sexual activity does not depend exclusively on the individual's sexual desire (Santtila et al., 2007). This may explain the weak-to-moderate association between sexual desire and sexual frequency with stable or casual partners observed in our study and the weak association with the number of sexual partners.

In the process of validating the SDI-2, we paid special attention to ensure that the factorial solution resulting from the CFA was equally applicable to multiple populations that may be assessed through this scale. According to Sakaluk (2019), testing invariance (in brief, to what extent a measure is equally applicable to different populations) constitutes one of the most pressing statistical challenges in sexual science, in particular when it comes to validating self-report assessment scales. To address this limitation, we tested four levels of measurement invariance (namely, configural, metric, scalar, and residual) and two levels of structural invariance (namely, latent variance-covariance and mean) according to country, language, gender, and sexual orientation. To our knowledge, previous studies have tested the applicability of the SDI-2 according to one of these variables (e.g., gender [Vallejo-medina et al., 2020] or sexual orientation [Mark et al., 2017]), but this is the first time that the SDI-2 invariance is tested in all these variables simultaneously, including a very large number of subgroups (specifically, 22 languages, 35 countries, three genders, and eight sexual orientations), and through a robust statistical approach (multi-group CFAs testing six different levels of invariance). In this sense, this research provides empirical evidence that the SDI-2 is equally applicable in all investigated languages, countries, genders, and sexual orientations without potential measurement biases (i.e., without

changes in its factorial structure, factorial loadings, intercepts, or measurement errors). Given that the SDI-2 has been demonstrated to be psychometrically sound, cross-culturally acceptable, and meaningful for assessing sexual desire in multiple populations, it may constitute a sound instrument for use in large scale cross-cultural studies investigating sexual behavior (Bothe et al., 2021; de Graaf et al., 2023).

That said, invariance tests demonstrated group-based differences in variance, covariance, and means according to country, language, gender, and sexual orientation. These differences were supported by analyses in which we inspected the average total SDI-2 scores according to these variables. In particular, we found small-to-moderate differences in sexual desire according to country and language, and moderate-to-large differences according to gender and sexual orientation. These findings support the importance of cultural context with respect to sexual desire (Hakim, 2015). However, it is important to note that the distribution of participants by country was uneven and biased toward European countries (both Eastern and Western), an aspect that may limit the generalizability of the findings and warrants further research. Our research also supports the view that men and sexually diverse individuals experience higher levels of sexual desire (Frankenbach et al., 2022; Makarenko et al., 2022). Finally, the finding that asexual participants (i.e., individuals characterized by limited/no sexual attraction/desire [Van Houdenhove et al., 2015]) scored significantly lower on sexual desire than any other sexual orientation subgroup provides further support to the validity of the SDI-2.

Limitations and future directions

Despite study strengths (e.g., pre-registration, adhesion to open science practices, large sample size, cross-cultural involvement, and sound statistical approach), limitations exist. General limitations attributable to the ISS project include the use of convenience

sampling, cross-sectional design, online data collection, or the uneven distribution of participants according to the country (with Western and Eastern European citizens overrepresented) or other sociodemographic characteristics (such as age, level of education, socioeconomic status, or the number of children) (for more elaboration on these general limitations, see https://osf.io/6kscb?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5). As some of these aspects (e.g., age) may have an impact on the expression of sexual desire (Corona et al., 2013), our results should be interpreted with caution. Another limitation of this study is related to fact that data collection occurred during the last stages of the COVID-19 pandemic (between 2021-2022). As it is well-known that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted on different aspects of sexuality (including sexual desire [Ballester et al., 2021]), findings should be interpreted with caution. The study was also limited in that it did not assess test-retest reliability or responsiveness (two important psychometric properties of screening scales [Mokkink et al., 2018]). Given that these two properties of the SDI-2 have not been tested yet (Cartagena-Ramos et al., 2018), future studies examining these characteristics are warranted. Similarly, the SDI-2 lacks clinical cut-off scores for the identification of individuals at risk of showing problems related to their sexual desire. Even though the SDI-2 was not designed for diagnostic purposes, we believe that determining a threshold for the screening of individuals at risk of hypoactive sexual desire may be beneficial. Finally, this study only included a limited number of secondary measures, thus hindering our ability to examine convergent, divergent, and discriminative validity more comprehensively.

Conclusions

The SDI-2 is a psychometrically sound scale for assessing sexual desire. Our study revealed that the SDI-2 assesses three related yet relatively independent factors of sexual

desire, namely solitary sexual desire (i.e., desire to engage in sexual activities with oneself), partner-related sexual desire (i.e., sexual desire for a stable partner), and attractive-person-related sexual desire (i.e., sexual desire for an attractive person). The SDI-2 demonstrated potentially bias-free comparisons of scores according to country, language, gender, and sexual orientation. This important property, together with its demonstrated ability to quantify group-based differences in sexual desire, supports the utility of the SDI-2 for large-scale cross-cultural studies involving diverse populations.

REFERENCES

- Apt, C. V., & Hurlbert, D. F. (1992). Motherhood and Female Sexuality Beyond One Year Postpartum: A Study of Military Wives. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 18*(2), 104–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614576.1992.11074044>
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (2011). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(1), 8–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0278-x>
- Ballester, R., Juan, A., Garcia, E. N., Ruiz, E., Cristina, P., & García, G. (2021). “INSIDE” Project on Sexual Health in Spain : Sexual Life During the Lockdown Caused by COVID-19. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 18*, 1023–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-020-00506-1>
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the Process of Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Self-Report Measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186–3191.
- Bothe, B., Koós, M., Nagy, L., Kraus, S. W., Potenza, M. N., & Demetrovics, Z. (2021). International Sex Survey: Study protocol of a large, cross-cultural collaborative study in 45 countries. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 10*(3), 632–645. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2021.00063>
- Brahim, F. Ben, Rothen, S., Bianchi-Demicheli, F., Courtois, R., & Khazaal, Y. (2019). Contribution of sexual desire and motives to the compulsive use of cybersex. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 8*(3), 442–450. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.8.2019.47>
- Callea, A., & Rossi, G. (2021). Italian validation of the sexual desire inventory (SDI-2): psychometric properties and factorial structure. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry, 18*(4), 223–230.
- Cartagena-Ramos, D., Fuentealba-Torres, M., Rebutini, F., Leite, A. C. A. B., Alvarenga, W. D. A., Arcêncio, R. A., Dantas, R. A. S., & Nascimento, L. C. (2018). Systematic review of the psychometric properties of instruments to measure sexual desire. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 18*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0570-2>

- Cervilla, O., Vallejo-medina, P., Gómez-berrocal, C., & Sierra, J. C. (2021). Development of the Spanish short version of Negative Attitudes Toward Masturbation Inventory. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 21*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2021.100222>
- Chadwick, S. B., Burke, S. M., Goldey, K. L., Bell, S. N., & van Anders, S. M. (2017). Sexual Desire in Sexual Minority and Majority Women and Men: The Multifaceted Sexual Desire Questionnaire. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*(8), 2465–2484.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0895-z>
- Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of Goodness of Fit Indexes to Lack of Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 14*(3), 464–504.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*(2), 233–255.
- Clayton, A. H., Segraves, R. T., Leiblum, S., Basson, R., Pyke, R., Cotton, D., Lewis-D'Agostino, D., Evans, K. R., Sills, T. L., & Wunderlich, G. R. (2006). Reliability and validity of the Sexual Interest and Desire Inventory-Female (SIDF), a scale designed to measure severity of female hypoactive sexual desire disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 32*(2), 115–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00926230500442300>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155>
- Conaglen, H. M., & Evans, I. M. (2006). Pictorial Cues and Sexual Desire: An Experimental Approach. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 35*(2), 197–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-005-9000-8>
- Corona, G., Rastrelli, G., Maseroli, E., Forti, G., & Maggi, M. (2013). Sexual function of the ageing male. *Best Practice & Research. Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 27*(4), 581–601.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beem.2013.05.007>

de Graaf, H., Mitchell, K., Clifton, S., Lara, M. F., Dewaele, A., Dupont, J., Klapilova, K., Lazdāne, G., Briken, P., Træen, B., Bajos, N., Ljungcrantz, D., & Kontula, O. (2023). Sex Surveys in Europe: Reflections on over Four Decades of Sexual Behavior and Sexual Health Surveillance. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 1–14.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2023.2222403>

Diamond, L. M. (2003). What Does Sexual Orientation Orient ? A Biobehavioral Model

Distinguishing Romantic Love and Sexual Desire. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 173–192.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.1.173>

Diamond, L. M. (2004). Emerging Perspectives on Distinctions Between Romantic Love and Sexual Desire. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(3), 116–119.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00287.x>

Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2013). Nonnormal and categorical data in structural equation models. In *Structural Equation Modeling: A Second Course* (2nd Editio, p. 703). Information Age Publishing.

Frankenbach, J., Weber, M., Loschelder, D. D., Kilger, H., & Friese, M. (2022). Sex drive:

Theoretical conceptualization and meta-analytic review of gender differences. *Psychological Bulletin*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000366>

Goldhammer, D. L., & McCabe, M. P. (2011). Development and Psychometric Properties of the Female Sexual Desire Questionnaire (FSDQ). *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 8(9), 2512–2521. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-6109.2011.02334.x>

Hakim, C. (2015). The male sexual deficit: A social fact of the 21st century. *International Sociology*, 30(3), 314–335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580915569090>

Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (1993). Historical and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Passionate Love and Sexual Desire. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 4(1), 67–97.

Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (2006). Passionate Love, Sexual Desire, and Mate Selection: Cross-

- Cultural and Historical Perspectives. In *Close relationships: Functions, forms and processes*. (pp. 227–243). Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis (UK).
- Heiman, J. R., Rupp, H., Janssen, E., Newhouse, S. K., Brauer, M., & Laan, E. (2011). Sexual desire, sexual arousal and hormonal differences in premenopausal US and Dutch women with and without low sexual desire. *Hormones and Behavior*, *59*(5), 772–779.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.03.013>
- Holmberg, D., & Blair, K. L. (2009). Sexual Desire, Communication, Satisfaction, and Preferences of Men and Women in Same-Sex Versus Mixed-Sex Relationships Sexual Desire , Communication , Satisfaction , and Preferences of Men and Women in Same-Sex Versus Mixed-Sex Relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *46*(1), 57–66.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490802645294>
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural Equation Modeling: Guidelines for Determining Model Fit. *Electronic Journal on Business Research Methods*, *6*(1), 53–60.
- Howard, M. C. (2016). A Review of Exploratory Factor Analysis Decisions and Overview of Current Practices: What We Are Doing and How Can We Improve? *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, *32*(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2015.1087664>
- Hunsley, J., & Mash, E. J. (2008). *A guide to assessments that work*. Oxford University Press.
- Kaplan, H. S. (1979). *Disorders of Sexual Desire and Other New Concepts and Techniques in Sex Therapy*. Brunner/Mazel.
- King, B. E., & Allgeier, E. R. (2000). The Sexual Desire Inventory as a Measure of Sexual Motivation in College Students. *Psychological Reports*, *86*(1), 347–350.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2000.86.1.347>
- Kuhn, W., Koenig, J., Donoghue, A., Hillecke, T. K., & Warth, M. (2014). Psychometrische Eigenschaften einer deutschsprachigen Kurzversion des Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2). *Zeitschrift Fur Sexualforschung*, *27*(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1055/S-0034-1366582/BIB>

- Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863>
- Levine, S. B. (2003). The nature of sexual desire: a clinician's perspective. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*(3), 279–285.
- Little, R. J. A. (1988). A Test of Missing Completely at Random for Multivariate Data with Missing Values A Test of Missing Completely at Random for Multivariate Data With Missing Values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83*(404), 1198–1202.
- Makarenko, B., Jabs, F., & Brotto, L. A. (2022). Using the 3-factor Sexual Desire Inventory to understand sexual desire in a sexually diverse sample with and without sexual interest/arousal disorder. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 31*(2), 231–241.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs.2022-0013>
- Mark, K. P., Toland, M. D., Rosenkrantz, D. E., Brown, H., & Hong, S.-H. (2017). Validation of the Sexual Desire Inventory for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Queer Adults. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 5*(1), 122–128.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000260>
- Markland, D. (2007). The golden rule is that there are no golden rules: A commentary on Paul Barrett's recommendations for reporting model fit in structural equation modelling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(5), 851–858.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.023>
- Milfont, T. L., & Fischer, R. (2010). Testing measurement invariance across groups : Applications in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Psychological Research, 3*(1), 111–121.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9143-x>
- Mokkink, L. B., de Vet, H. C. W., Prinsen, C. A. C., Patrick, D. L., Alonso, J., Bouter, L. M., & Terwee, C. B. (2018). COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist for systematic reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. *Quality of Life Research, 27*(5), 1171–1179.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4>

Moyano, N., Vallejo-Medina, P., & Sierra, J. C. (2017). Sexual Desire Inventory: Two or Three Dimensions? *Journal of Sex Research*, *54*(1), 105–116.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1109581>

Ortega, V., Zubeidat, I., & Sierra, J. C. (2006). Further examination of measurement properties of Spanish version of the Sexual Desire Inventory with undergraduates and adolescent students. *Psychological Reports*, *99*, 147–165.

Peixoto, M. M., Gomes, H., Correia, A., Pires, I., Pereira, T., & Machado, P. P. P. (2020).

Translation and validation of the Portuguese version of the Sexual Desire Inventory-2: assessing gender differences. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, *35*(1), 89–102.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2018.1472374>

Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2010). A meta-analytic review of research on gender differences in sexuality, 1993-2007. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(1), 21–38.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017504>

Revelle, W. (2023). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research* (2.3.6). Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

Rochat, L., Bianchi-Demicheli, F., Aboujaoude, E., & Khazaal, Y. (2019). The psychology of “swiping”: A cluster analysis of the mobile dating app Tinder. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *8*(4), 804–813. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.8.2019.58>

Rosen, R., Brown, C., Heiman, J., Leiblum, S., Meston, C., Shabsigh, R., Ferguson, D., & D’Agostino, R. (2000). The Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI): a multidimensional self-report instrument for the assessment of female sexual function. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *26*(2), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262300278597>

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(2), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02>

Rubin, J. D., Conley, T. D., Klein, V., Liu, J., Lehane, C. M., & Dammeyer, J. (2019). A cross-

- national examination of sexual desire: The roles of 'gendered cultural scripts' and 'sexual pleasure' in predicting heterosexual women's desire for sex. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 151(May), 109502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.07.012>
- Rutkowski, L., & Svetina, D. (2014). Assessing the Hypothesis of Measurement Invariance in the Context of Large-Scale International Surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 74(1), 31–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413498257>
- Sakaluk, J. K. (2019). Expanding Statistical Frontiers in Sexual Science: Taxometric, Invariance, and Equivalence Testing. *Journal of Sex Research*, 56(4–5), 475–510. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1568377>
- Santtila, P., Wager, I., Witting, K., Harlaar, N., Jern, P., Johansson, A., Varjonen, M., & Kenneth, N. (2007). Discrepancies between Sexual Desire and Sexual Activity : Gender Differences and Associations with Relationship Satisfaction Discrepancies between Sexual Desire and Sexual Activity : Gender Differences and. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 34(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00926230701620548>
- Sarin, S., Amsel, R. M., & Binik, Y. M. (2013). Disentangling Desire and Arousal : A Classificatory Conundrum. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42, 1079–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0100-6>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research*, 8(2), 28–74.
- Spector, I. P., Carey, M. P., & Steinberg, L. (1996). The sexual desire inventory: Development, factor structure, and Evidence of Reliability. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 22(3), 175–190. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00926239608414655>
- Toledano, R., & Pfaus, J. (2006). The Sexual Arousal and Desire Inventory (SADI): A Multidimensional Scale to Assess Subjective Sexual Arousal and Desire. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 3(5), 853–877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-6109.2006.00293.x>

- Vallejo-medina, P., Rojas-paoli, I., & Álvarez-muelas, A. (2020). Validation of the Sexual Desire Inventory in Colombia. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 46(4), 385–398.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2020.1739181>
- Van Houdenhove, E., Gijs, L., T'Sjoen, G., & Enzlin, P. (2015). Asexuality : A Multidimensional Approach Asexuality : A Multidimensional Approach. *Journal of Sex R*, 52(6), 669–678.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2014.898015>
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A Review and Synthesis of the Measurement Invariance Literature: Suggestions, Practices, and Recommendations for Organizational Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(1), 4–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>
- Vowels, L. M. (2023). Sexual Desire: Relationship Factors. In T. K. Shackelford (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Sexual Psychology and Behavior* (pp. 1–2). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08956-5_2187-1
- Woo, J. S. T., Brotto, L. A., & Gorzalka, B. B. (2011). The role of sex guilt in the relationship between culture and women's sexual desire. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40(2), 385–394.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-010-9609-0>
- Zinbarg, R. E., Revelle, W., Yovel, I., & Li, W. (2005). Cronbach's α , Revelle's β , and McDonald's ω H: their relations with each other and two alternative conceptualizations of reliability. *Psychometrika*, 70(1), 123–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-003-0974-7>

Table 1. Participants' sociodemographic characteristics ($n=82,243$)

	<i>M (SD) or % (n)</i>
<i>Age</i>	32.39 (12.52)
<i>Country of residence</i>	
Algeria	0.03% (24)
Australia	0.78% (639)
Austria	0.91% (746)
Bangladesh	0.45% (373)
Belgium	0.78% (644)
Bolivia	0.47% (385)
Brazil	4.35% (3,579)
Canada	3.09% (2,541)
Chile	1.43% (1,173)
China	2.95% (2,428)
Colombia	2.33% (1,913)
Croatia	2.91% (2,390)
Czech Republic	1.99% (1,640)
Ecuador	0.34% (276)
France	2.07% (1,706)
Germany	3.98% (3,271)
Gibraltar	0.08% (64)
Hungary	13.62% (11,200)
India	0.24% (194)
Iraq	0.12% (99)
Ireland	2.07% (1,702)
Israel	1.62% (1,334)
Italy	2.92% (2,401)
Japan	0.68% (562)
Lithuania	2.45% (2,015)
Malaysia	1.42% (1,170)
Mexico	2.60% (2,137)
New Zealand	3.45% (2,834)
North Macedonia	1.52% (1,251)
Panama	0.40% (333)
Peru	3.25% (2,672)
Poland	12.03% (9,892)
Portugal	2.75% (2,262)
Slovakia	1.38% (1,134)
South Africa	2.25% (1,849)
South Korea	1.78% (1,464)
Spain	2.83% (2,327)
Switzerland	1.39% (1,144)
Taiwan	3.24% (2,668)
Turkey	1.00% (820)
United Kingdom	1.72% (1,412)

United States of America	2.92% (2,398)
Other	1.43% (1,177)
<i>Language</i>	
Arabic	0.17% (142)
Bangla	0.40% (332)
Croatian	3.07% (2,522)
Czech	1.92% (1,583)
Dutch	0.63% (518)
English	17.02% (13,994)
French	4.79% (3,941)
German	4.25% (3,494)
Hebrew	1.60% (1,315)
Hindi	0.02% (17)
Hungarian	13.30% (10,937)
Italian	2.96% (2,437)
Japanese	0.57% (466)
Korean	1.75% (1,437)
Lithuanian	2.55% (2,094)
Macedonian	1.58% (1,301)
Mandarin – simplified	3.01% (2,474)
Mandarin – traditional	3.26% (2,685)
Polish	12.58% (10,343)
Portuguese – Brazil	4.44% (3,650)
Portuguese – Portugal	2.77% (2,277)
Romanian	0.09% (75)
Slovak	2.58% (2,118)
Spanish – Latin America	10.85% (8,926)
Spanish – Spain	2.81% (2,312)
Turkish	1.04% (853)
<i>Ethnic minority status</i>	
Ethnic minority (yes)	6.9% (5,640)
<i>Sex assigned at birth</i>	
Male	40.43% (33,245)
Female	59.57% (48,987)
<i>Gender (original answer options in the survey)</i>	
Masculine/Man	39.59% (32,549)
Feminine/Woman	57.02% (46,874)
Indigenous or other cultural gender minority identity (e.g., two-spirit)	0.20% (166)
Non-binary, gender fluid, or something else (e.g., genderqueer)	2.81% (2,315)
Other	0.37% (302)
<i>Gender (categories used in the analyses)</i>	
Men	39.59% (32,549)
Women	57.02% (46,874)
Gender-diverse individuals	3.38% (2,783)
<i>Trans status</i>	

No, I am not a trans person	96.43% (79,280)
Yes, I am a trans man	0.43% (357)
Yes, I am a trans woman	0.36% (295)
Yes, I am a non-binary trans person	1.07% (881)
I am questioning my gender identity	1.38% (1,137)
I don't know what it means	0.33% (269)
<i>Sexual orientation (original answer options in the survey)</i>	
Heterosexual/Straight	68.24% (56,125)
Gay or lesbian or homosexual	5.60% (4,607)
Hetero-flexible	7.54% (6,200)
Homo-flexible	0.65% (534)
Bisexual	9.35% (7,688)
Queer	1.16% (957)
Pansexual	2.39% (1,969)
Asexual	1.29% (1,064)
I do not know yet or I am currently questioning my sexual orientation	2.37% (1,951)
None of the above	0.98% (807)
I don't want to answer	0.37% (308)
<i>Sexual orientation (categories used in the analyses)</i>	
Heterosexual/straight	68.52% (56,125)
Gay or lesbian	5.62% (4,607)
Bisexual	9.38% (7,688)
Queer and pansexual	3.57% (2,926)
Homo- and hetero-flexible identities	8.22% (6,734)
Asexual	1.29% (1,064)
Questioning	2.38% (1,951)
Other	0.98% (807)
<i>Highest level of education</i>	
Primary (e.g., elementary school)	1.22% (1,002)
Secondary (e.g., high school)	24.71% (20,325)
Tertiary (e.g., college or university)	74.06% (60,896)
<i>Currently being in education</i>	
Not being in education	60.58% (49,802)
Being in primary education (e.g., elementary school)	0.08% (64)
Being in secondary education (e.g., high school)	1.91% (1,571)
Being in tertiary education (e.g., college or university)	37.42% (30,762)
<i>Work status</i>	
Not working	25.36% (20,853)
Working full time	52.27% (42,981)
Working part-time	13.81% (11,356)
Doing odd jobs	8.55% (7,029)
<i>Socioeconomic status</i>	
My life circumstances are among the worst	0.28% (227)
My life circumstances are much worse than average	0.94% (773)
My life circumstances are worse than average	5.15% (4,232)

My life circumstances are average	32.52% (26,742)
My life circumstances are better than average	38.38% (31,567)
My life circumstances are much better than average	17.92% (14,736)
My life circumstances are among the best	4.81% (3,957)
<i>Residence</i>	
Metropolis (population is over 1 million people)	32.15% (26,441)
City (population is between 100,000-999,999 people)	36.38% (29,920)
Town (population is between 1,000-99,999 people)	25.66% (21,103)
Village (population is below 1,000 people)	5.79% (4,764)
<i>Relationship status</i>	
Single	33.49% (27,541)
In a relationship	33.37% (27,440)
Married or common-law partners	29.60% (24,338)
Widow or widower	0.52% (428)
Divorced	3.01% (2,472)
<i>Number of children</i>	
None	70.64% (57,909)
1	10.26% (8,417)
2	12.62% (10,353)
3	4.68% (3,843)
4	1.23% (1,014)
5	0.35% (290)
6-9	0.15% (125)
10 or more	0.03% (24)

Note. Percentages might not add up to 100% due to missing data. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the items and total score of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2) (total Sample [$N=82,243$])

Items	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew.	<i>SE</i>	Kurt.	<i>SE</i>
Item 1. During the last month, how often would you have liked to engage in sexual activity with a partner (for example, touching each other's genitals, giving or receiving oral stimulation, intercourse, etc.)?	0-7	3.74	2.09	-0.36	0.02	-0.82	0.02
Item 2. During the last month, how often have you had sexual thoughts involving a partner?	0-7	4.13	2.23	-0.51	0.02	-0.87	0.02
Item 3. When you have sexual thoughts, how strong is your desire to engage in sexual behavior with a partner?	0-8	5.48	2.12	-0.90	0.02	0.30	0.02
Item 4. When you first see an attractive person, how strong is your sexual desire?	0-8	3.44	2.29	0.14	0.02	-0.93	0.02
Item 5. When you spend time with an attractive person (for example, at work or school), how strong is your sexual desire?	0-8	3.42	2.33	0.13	0.02	-1.02	0.02
Item 6. When you are in romantic situations (such as a candle lit dinner, a walk on the beach, etc.), how strong is your sexual desire?	0-8	4.76	2.17	-0.48	0.02	-0.51	0.02
Item 7. How strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner?	0-8	5.70	2.16	-1.00	0.02	0.35	0.02
Item 8. How important is it for you to fulfill your sexual desire through activity with a partner?	0-8	5.53	2.26	-0.91	0.02	0.04	0.02
Item 9. Compared to other people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually with a partner?	0-8	4.61	2.12	-0.44	0.02	-0.36	0.02
Item 10. During the last month, how often would you have liked to behave sexually by yourself (for example, masturbating, touching your genitals etc.)?	0-7	3.32	2.07	-0.06	0.02	-1.06	0.02
Item 11. How strong is your desire to engage in sexual behavior by yourself?	0-8	4.19	2.31	-0.24	0.02	-0.85	0.02
Item 12. How important is it for you to fulfill your desires to behave sexually by yourself?	0-8	4.12	2.50	-0.18	0.02	-1.06	0.02
Item 13. Compared to other people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually by yourself?	0-8	4.00	2.26	-0.18	0.02	-0.74	0.02
Total score ^a	0-101	56.53	19.11	-0.57	0.16	0.23	0.19

Note. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation, Skew. = skewness, *SE* = standard error, Kurt. = kurtosis; ^a=as aforementioned, Item 14 was not included in the calculation of the total score.

Table 3. Confirmatory Factor Analyses' fit indices, standardized factorial loadings, and reliability (total Sample [$n=82,243$])

	λ (SDI-2)	α (SDI-2)	ω (SDI-2)	WLSMV χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI
<i>Competing factorial solutions</i>									
Model 1 (original two-factor model)				47927.469	43	0.922	0.900	0.117	0.116-0.118
Model 2 (two-factor model with 2 excluded items)				52809.015	64	0.943	0.930	0.101	0.100-0.102
Model 3 (three-factor model)				18013.260	62	0.980	0.975	0.060	0.059-0.060
<i>Factor 1 (Partner-related sexual desire)</i>									
		0.88	0.92						
Item 1	0.70								
Item 2	0.70								
Item 3	0.77								
Item 6	0.63								
Item 7	0.82								
Item 8	0.66								
Item 9	0.78								
<i>Factor 2 (Solitary Sexual Desire)</i>									
		0.91	0.92						
Item 10	0.79								
Item 11	0.91								
Item 12	0.80								
Item 13	0.88								
<i>Factor 3 (Attractive-person-related sexual desire)</i>									
		0.89	0.89						
Item 4	0.90								
Item 5	0.89								
<i>Total Score</i>									
		0.89	0.94						
<i>Inter-factor correlations of the SDI-2</i>									
	1	2							
1. Partner-related sexual desire									
2. Solitary sexual desire	0.38***								
3. Attractive-person-related sexual desire	0.43***	0.41***							

Note. All factor loadings and correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$; λ = standardized factor loading; α = Cronbach's alpha, ω = McDonald's omega. WLSMV = weighted least squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator; χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; 90% CI = 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA. *** indicates $p < .01$.

Table 4. Associations between the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2) and Theoretically Relevant Constructs (convergent validity)

	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)	0-101	56.53	19.11	59							
2. Lifetime number of sexual partners (in and out of arelationship)	0-1000	12.59	42.53	4.00	0.13**	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Past-year sexual frequency (in and out of a relationship) ^a	0-10	4.07	2.72	5.00	0.27**	0.10**	-	-	-	-	-
4. Past-year sexual frequency (with the partner) ^b	0-1000	5.30	2.14	6.00	0.20**	-0.00	0.86**	-	-	-	-
5. Number of past-year casual sexual partners	0-340	1.12	5.85	0.00	0.11**	0.39**	0.08**	0.00	-	-	-
6. Past-year casual sexual frequency ^a	0-10	0.74	1.59	0.00	0.22**	0.26**	0.18**	0.03**	0.37**		
7. Past-year frequency of masturbation ^a	0-10	5.36	2.61	6.00	0.56**	0.10**	-0.02**	0.02**	0.10**	0.18**	
8. Past-year frequency of pornography use ^a	0-10	4.22	3.02	4.00	0.47**	0.11**	-0.04**	-0.01	0.11**	0.14**	0.68**

Note. *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; *Mdn* = median; a = 0: never, 1: once in the past year, 2: 2-6 times in the past year, 3: 7-11 times in the past year, 4: monthly, 5: 2-3 times a month, 6: weekly, 7: 2-3 times a week, 8: 4-5 times a week, 9: 6-7 times a week, 10: more than 7 times a week; b = Only partnered individuals responded to this question (*n* = 51,754). * *p* < .001.

Table S1. Average age according to the country of residence

	<i>M (SD)</i>
Algeria	34.7 (14.6)
Australia	40.7 (16.2)
Austria	33.2 (11.8)
Bangladesh	22.9 (4.66)
Belgium	39.8 (13.9)
Bolivia	28.5 (10.2)
Brazil	42.7 (12.3)
Canada	34.8 (13.7)
Chile	28.2 (9.10)
China	28.2 (10.3)
Colombia	25.9 (9.97)
Croatia	28.7 (8.83)
Czech Republic	47.1 (16.9)
Ecuador	29.7 (11.9)
France	32.9 (13.2)
Germany	42.2 (15.3)
Gibraltar	39.7 (14.7)
Hungary	35.9 (12.1)
India	29.8 (9.99)
Iraq	35.6 (14.3)
Ireland	33.2 (13.9)
Israel	37.5 (11.7)
Italy	27.3 (7.96)
Japan	38.0 (12.4)
Lithuania	33.9 (11.0)
Malaysia	26.8 (8.88)
Mexico	31.7 (11.9)
New Zealand	37.1 (14.4)
North Macedonia	29.5 (10.2)
Panama	36.0 (13.4)
Peru	31.8 (11.0)
Poland	26.5 (6.10)
Portugal	30.6 (10.3)
Slovakia	27.7 (9.18)
South Africa	30.2 (14.2)
South Korea	25.8 (7.11)
Spain	24.5 (7.33)
Switzerland	29.5 (11.2)
Taiwan	30.9 (7.99)
Turkey	29.6 (9.67)
United Kingdom	33.8 (13.8)
United States of America	31.6 (14.7)
Other	30.0 (10.4)

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation.

Table S2. Language-based CFAs and measurement invariance of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	WLSMV χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	Comp.	Δ df	Δ CFI	Δ TLI	Δ RMSEA
<i>Language-based CFAs</i>											
Croatian	814.022*	62	0.963	0.953	0.070	0.066-0.074	—	—	—	—	—
Czech	305.110*	62	0.990	0.987	0.050	0.045-0.056	—	—	—	—	—
Dutch	104.451	62	0.993	0.992	0.037	0.024-0.048	—	—	—	—	—
English	2350.713*	62	0.988	0.985	0.052	0.050-0.053	—	—	—	—	—
French	623.474*	62	0.987	0.984	0.048	0.045-0.052	—	—	—	—	—
German	739.274*	62	0.984	0.980	0.056	0.053-0.060	—	—	—	—	—
Hebrew	254.778*	62	0.979	0.973	0.049	0.043-0.055	—	—	—	—	—
Hungarian	3784.137*	62	0.954	0.943	0.074	0.072-0.077	—	—	—	—	—
Italian	584.549*	62	0.979	0.974	0.059	0.055-0.064	—	—	—	—	—
Japanese	345.303*	62	0.955	0.944	0.100	0.089-0.110	—	—	—	—	—
Korean	715.359*	62	0.971	0.963	0.086	0.080-0.091	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuanian	599.386*	62	0.972	0.964	0.065	0.060-0.070	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonian	347.101*	62	0.982	0.977	0.060	0.054-0.066	—	—	—	—	—
Mandarin – simplified	874.188*	62	0.980	0.975	0.073	0.069-0.077	—	—	—	—	—
Mandarin – traditional	720.219*	62	0.989	0.986	0.063	0.059-0.067	—	—	—	—	—
Polish	2815.345*	62	0.969	0.961	0.067	0.065-0.069	—	—	—	—	—
Portuguese – Brazil	1792.170*	62	0.944	0.929	0.088	0.084-0.091	—	—	—	—	—
Portuguese – Portugal	451.470*	62	0.983	0.978	0.053	0.048-0.057	—	—	—	—	—
Slovak	421.028*	62	0.984	0.979	0.053	0.048-0.058	—	—	—	—	—
Spanish – Latin American	2077.573*	62	0.985	0.981	0.061	0.059-0.063	—	—	—	—	—
Spanish – Spain	727.490*	62	0.968	0.960	0.069	0.064-0.073	—	—	—	—	—
Turkish	448.165*	62	0.939	0.923	0.086	0.078-0.093	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Language-based measurement invariance</i>											
M1. Configural	21895.303*	1364	0.978	0.972	0.064	0.063-0.065	—	—	—	—	—
M2. Metric	31108.057*	1574	0.968	0.966	0.072	0.071-0.072	M2-M1	210	-0.001	-0.006	+0.008
M3. Scalar	47213.068*	1784	0.951	0.953	0.083	0.083-0.084	M3-M2	210	-0.017	-0.013	+0.011
M3a. Partial scalar ^a	45561.058*	2111	0.954	0.956	0.081	0.081-0.082	M3a-M2	537	-0.014	-0.010	+0.009
M3b. Partial scalar ^b	43107.825*	2110	0.957	0.958	0.079	0.078-0.080	M3b-M2	536	-0.011	-0.008	0.007
M3c. Partial scalar ^c	41712.806*	2109	0.958	0.960	0.078	0.078-0.079	M3c-M2	535	-0.010	-0.006	-0.006
M4. Residual	52796.355*	2433	0.947	0.956	0.081	0.081-0.082	M4-M3c	329	-0.011	-0.004	+0.003
M4a. Partial residual ^d	39360.325*	2307	0.961	0.966	0.072	0.071-0.072	M4a-M3c	198	+0.003	+0.006	-0.006
M5. Latent variance-covariance	127501.328*	2183	0.866	0.895	0.125	0.125-0.126	M5-M4a	124	-0.095	-0.071	+0.053
M6. Latent mean	162044.098*	2246	0.829	0.870	0.139	0.139-0.140	M6-M5	63	-0.037	-0.025	+0.014

Note. WLSMV = weighted least squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator; χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; 90% CI = 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA; Comp. = Comparison; Δ CFI =

change in CFI value compared to the preceding model; Δ TLI = change in the TLI value compared to the preceding model; Δ RMSEA = change in the RMSEA value compared to the preceding model; ^a= The residual variance of Item 1 was freed in Spanish–Spain; ^b= The residual variance of Item 8 was freed in Italian; ^c= The residual variance of Item 12 was freed in Italian; ^d= **The partial residual variance of Item 6 was freed in English**; * $p < .001$

Table S3. Language-based descriptive statistics on the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	SDI-2 total score			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
<i>Languages^a</i>				
Portuguese – Brazil	64.07	17.90	0	101
Hungarian	62.63	15.78	0	101
Turkish	62.14	16.77	0	98
Spanish – Spain	59.35	17.52	0	101
Italian	58.51	17.52	0	101
Croatian	58.34	16.95	0	101
Hebrew	57.94	15.24	0	99
French	57.55	18.42	0	101
Portuguese – Portugal	57.50	16.79	0	97
Dutch	57.21	18.32	0	98
German	57.12	18.41	0	99
Slovak	57.11	18.46	0	101
English	56.72	20.53	0	101
Lithuanian	56.36	17.09	0	101
Japanese	55.73	21.43	0	101
Macedonian	54.19	20.03	0	101
Korean	53.66	21.61	0	101
Polish	52.81	16.12	0	101
Spanish – Latin American	52.66	20.84	0	101
Czech	50.60	20.79	0	101
Mandarin – traditional	50.18	22.49	0	101
Mandarin – simplified	48.88	21.24	0	101

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation, Min.=minimum, Max=maximum; ^a=The same languages as in the language-based measurement invariance tests

Table S4. Country-based CFAs and measurement invariance of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	WLSMV χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	Comp.	Δ df	Δ CFI	Δ TLI	Δ RMSEA
<i>Country-based CFAs</i>											
<i>Dataset 1</i>											
Australia	111.954*	62	0.994	0.992	0.036	0.025-0.046	—	—	—	—	—
Austria	172.908*	62	0.984	0.980	0.049	0.041-0.058	—	—	—	—	—
Belgium	129.181*	62	0.990	0.988	0.041	0.031-0.051	—	—	—	—	—
Bolivia	108.034*	62	0.991	0.989	0.044	0.030-0.058	—	—	—	—	—
Brazil	1708.391*	62	0.946	0.932	0.087	0.083-0.090	—	—	—	—	—
Canada	386.521*	62	0.988	0.985	0.045	0.041-0.050	—	—	—	—	—
Chile	436.485*	62	0.979	0.973	0.072	0.066-0.079	—	—	—	—	—
China	847.686*	62	0.980	0.975	0.072	0.068-0.077	—	—	—	—	—
Colombia	569.497*	62	0.982	0.977	0.066	0.061-0.071	—	—	—	—	—
Croatia	786.461*	62	0.963	0.953	0.070	0.066-0.075	—	—	—	—	—
Czech Republic	317.077*	62	0.989	0.987	0.050	0.045-0.056	—	—	—	—	—
France	255.588*	62	0.991	0.988	0.043	0.038-0.049	—	—	—	—	—
Germany	636.313*	62	0.985	0.981	0.054	0.050-0.057	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	3436.601*	62	0.961	0.951	0.070	0.068-0.072	—	—	—	—	—
Ireland	355.450*	62	0.985	0.981	0.053	0.048-0.058	—	—	—	—	—
Israel	253.005*	62	0.979	0.974	0.048	0.042-0.055	—	—	—	—	—
Italy	570.417*	62	0.980	0.975	0.059	0.055-0.063	—	—	—	—	—
Japan	357.244*	62	0.959	0.948	0.093	0.083-0.102	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Dataset 2</i>											
Lithuania	602.645*	62	0.971	0.963	0.066	0.061-0.071	—	—	—	—	—
Malaysia	297.972*	62	0.990	0.988	0.057	0.051-0.064	—	—	—	—	—
Mexico	676.366*	62	0.978	0.972	0.068	0.064-0.073	—	—	—	—	—
New Zealand	432.475*	62	0.989	0.987	0.046	0.042-0.050	—	—	—	—	—
North Macedonia	333.824*	62	0.982	0.978	0.060	0.054-0.066	—	—	—	—	—
Peru	557.186*	62	0.988	0.985	0.055	0.051-0.059	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2657.314*	62	0.969	0.961	0.066	0.064-0.068	—	—	—	—	—
Portugal	468.286*	62	0.982	0.977	0.054	0.050-0.059	—	—	—	—	—
Slovakia	213.154*	62	0.987	0.984	0.047	0.040-0.054	—	—	—	—	—
South Africa	283.854*	62	0.992	0.990	0.044	0.039-0.049	—	—	—	—	—
South Korea	726.031*	62	0.970	0.963	0.086	0.080-0.091	—	—	—	—	—
Spain	742.228*	62	0.968	0.959	0.069	0.065-0.074	—	—	—	—	—
Switzerland	207.707*	62	0.988	0.985	0.046	0.039-0.052	—	—	—	—	—
Taiwan	719.740*	62	0.989	0.986	0.063	0.059-0.067	—	—	—	—	—

Turkey	402.517*	62	0.947	0.933	0.082	0.075-0.090	—	—	—	—	—
United Kingdom	237.500*	62	0.991	0.988	0.045	0.039-0.051	—	—	—	—	—
United States	400.532*	62	0.990	0.988	0.048	0.043-0.052	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Country-based CFAs</i>											
Dataset 1											
M1. Configural	11438.811*	1116	0.976	0.969	0.065	0.064-0.066	—	—	—	—	—
M2. Metric	17679.041*	1286	0.961	0.958	0.076	0.075-0.077	M2-M1	170	-0.015	-0.011	+0.011
M3. Scalar	28159.139*	1456	0.937	0.939	0.091	0.090-0.092	M3-M2	170	-0.024	-0.019	+0.015
M3a. Partial scalar ^a	25941.679*	1455	0.942	0.944	0.087	0.086-0.088	M3a-M2	169	-0.019	-0.014	+0.011
M3b. Partial scalar ^b	23324.467*	1454	0.948	0.950	0.083	0.082-0.083	M3b-M2	168	-0.013	-0.008	+0.007
M3c. Partial scalar ^c	21509.701*	1453	0.950	0.952	0.081	0.080-0.082	M3c-M2	167	-0.011	-0.006	+0.005
M3d. Partial scalar ^d	20634.692*	1452	0.955	0.956	0.077	0.076-0.078	M3d-M2	166	-0.006	-0.002	+0.001
M4. Residual	30308.704*	1673	0.932	0.943	0.088	0.087-0.089	M4-M3d	221	-0.023	-0.013	+0.011
M4a. Partial residual^e	21999.648*	1404	0.952	0.958	0.076	0.075-0.077	M4a-M3d	48	-0.003	+0.002	-0.0001
M5. Latent variance-covariance	55252.696*	1779	0.873	0.900	0.117	0.116-0.117	M5-M4a	375	-0.079	-0.058	+0.041
M6. Latent mean	76014.904*	1830	0.824	0.865	0.135	0.135-0.136	M6-M5	51	-0.049	-0.035	+0.018
Dataset 2											
M1. Configural	9959.330*	1054	0.982	0.977	0.061	0.060-0.062	—	—	—	—	—
M2. Metric	12275.755*	1214	0.977	0.975	0.063	0.062-0.064	M2-M1	160	-0.005	-0.002	+0.002
M3. Scalar	17591.339*	1374	0.966	0.968	0.072	0.071-0.073	M3-M2	160	-0.011	-0.007	+0.009
M3a. Partial scalar ^f	16408.215*	1373	0.969	0.970	0.069	0.068-0.070	M3a-M2	159	-0.008	-0.005	+0.006
M4. Residual	19281.778*	1582	0.963	0.969	0.070	0.069-0.071	M4-M3a	209	-0.006	-0.001	+0.001
M5. Latent variance-covariance	60456.401*	1678	0.878	0.904	0.124	0.123-0.125	M5-M4	96	-0.085	-0.065	+0.054
M6. Latent mean	71428.920*	1726	0.855	0.889	0.133	0.132-0.134	M6-M5	48	-0.023	-0.015	+0.009

Note. WLSMV = weighted least squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator; χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; 90% CI = 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA; Comp. = Comparison; Δ CFI = change in CFI value compared to the preceding model; Δ TLI = change in the TLI value compared to the preceding model; Δ RMSEA = change in the RMSEA value compared to the preceding model; ^a= The residual variance of Item 1 was freed in China; ^b= The residual variance of Item 2 was freed in China; ^c= The residual variance of Item 8 was freed in Israel; ^d= The residual variance of Item 12 was freed in Israel; ^e= The residual variance of Item 12 was freed in Hungary; ^f= The residual variance of Item 2 was freed in Taiwan; * $p < .001$

Table S5. Country-based descriptive statistics on the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	SDI-2 total score			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
<i>Countries</i> ^a				
Brazil	64.02	17.99	0	101
Hungary	62.14	16.13	0	101
Turkey	61.83	17.11	0	98
Canada	60.29	18.64	0	101
Austria	60.29	17.02	2	99
Spain	59.36	17.54	0	101
Australia	59.24	19.94	0	101
New Zealand	58.51	19.32	0	101
Italy	58.42	17.64	0	101
Croatia	58.22	16.98	0	101
Israel	58.19	15.48	0	99
Belgium	57.98	17.42	1	98
Slovakia	57.74	18.73	0	100
Portugal	57.48	16.72	0	97
Mexico	56.88	20.35	0	101
Germany	56.82	18.45	0	101
Japan	56.67	21.02	0	101
France	56.66	19.66	0	101
United States of America	56.61	20.90	0	101
United Kingdom	56.38	19.86	0	101
Lithuania	56.28	17.17	0	101
Switzerland	56.25	17.53	0	100
Bolivia	56.15	20.27	0	101
Ireland	55.95	18.64	0	101
North Macedonia	53.78	20.02	0	101
South Korea	53.76	21.56	0	100
South Africa	53.73	20.62	0	101
Chile	53.61	21.18	0	98
Peru	53.43	20.13	0	101
Poland	52.79	16.10	0	101
Malaysia	50.89	23.72	0	101
Czech Republic	50.79	20.76	0	101
Taiwan	50.29	22.43	0	101
China	49.00	21.23	0	101
Colombia	45.31	20.35	0	98

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation, Min.=minimum, Max.=maximum;
^a=The same countries as in the country-based measurement invariance tests

Table S6. Gender-based CFAs and measurement invariance of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	WLSMV χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	Comp.	Δ df	Δ CFI	Δ TLI	Δ RMSEA
<i>Gender-based CFAs</i>											
Men	7800.229*	62	0.970	0.962	0.062	0.061-0.063	—	—	—	—	—
Women	10650.260*	62	0.981	0.976	0.061	0.060-0.062	—	—	—	—	—
Gender-diverse individuals	663.078*	62	0.988	0.985	0.060	0.056-0.064	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Gender-based measurement invariance</i>											
M1. Configural	19113.568*	186	0.978	0.972	0.061	0.061-0.062	—	—	—	—	—
M2. Metric	19480.286*	206	0.978	0.975	0.059	0.058-0.060	M2-M1	20	0	+0.030	-0.002
M3. Scalar	23845.384*	226	0.973	0.972	0.062	0.062-0.063	M3-M2	20	-0.005	-0.030	+0.003
M4. Residual	24729.188*	252	0.972	0.974	0.060	0.059-0.061	M4-M3	26	-0.001	+0.002	-0.002
M5. Latent variance-covariance	49571.269*	264	0.943	0.949	0.083	0.083-0.084	M5-M4	12	-0.029	-0.025	+0.023
M6. Latent mean	92287.654*	270	0.893	0.908	0.112	0.112-0.113	M6-M5	6	-0.050	-0.041	+0.029

Note. WLSMV = weighted least squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator; χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; 90% CI = 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA; Comp. = Comparison; Δ CFI = change in CFI value compared to the preceding model; Δ TLI = change in the TLI value compared to the preceding model; Δ RMSEA = change in the RMSEA value compared to the preceding model. * $p < .001$

Table S7. Gender-based descriptive statistics on the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	SDI-2 total score			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
<i>Gender</i> ^a				
Men	62.92	17.06	0	101
Women	52.32	18.98	0	101
Gender-diverse individuals	52.18	22.82	0	101

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation, Min.=minimum, Max=maximum;
^a=The same genders as in the gender-based measurement invariance tests

Table S8. Sexual orientation-based CFAs and measurement invariance of the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	WLSMV χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	90% CI	Comp.	Δ df	Δ CFI	Δ TLI	Δ RMSEA
<i>Sexual orientation-based CFAs</i>											
Heterosexual/straight	12321.944*	62	0.979	0.974	0.060	0.059-0.061	—	—	—	—	—
Gay or lesbian	1349.236*	62	0.965	0.956	0.068	0.064-0.071	—	—	—	—	—
Bisexual	2102.751*	62	0.972	0.965	0.066	0.063-0.068	—	—	—	—	—
Queer and pansexual	661.561*	62	0.981	0.977	0.058	0.054-0.062	—	—	—	—	—
Homo-and hetero-flexible identities	1667.211*	62	0.973	0.966	0.062	0.060-0.065	—	—	—	—	—
Asexual	91.841*	62	0.996	0.995	0.021	0.011-0.030	—	—	—	—	—
Questioning	521.293*	62	0.985	0.981	0.063	0.058-0.068	—	—	—	—	—
Other	240.189*	62	0.987	0.984	0.060	0.053-0.069	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Sexual orientation-based measurement invariance</i>											
M1. Configural	18956.025*	496	0.978	0.973	0.061	0.060-0.061	—	—	—	—	—
M2. Metric	19996.991*	566	0.977	0.975	0.058	0.058-0.059	M2-M1	70	+0.001	+0.002	+0.003
M3. Scalar	21891.653*	636	0.975	0.975	0.058	0.057-0.058	M3-M2	70	+0.002	0	0
M4. Residual	22537.110*	727	0.974	0.978	0.055	0.054-0.055	M4-M3	91	+0.001	+0.003	+0.003
M5. Latent variance-covariance	35990.912*	769	0.959	0.966	0.067	0.067-0.068	M5-M4	42	+0.015	-0.012	-0.012
M6. Latent mean	91368.324*	790	0.894	0.916	0.107	0.106-0.107	M6-M5	21	+0.065	-0.050	-0.040

Note. WLSMV = weighted least squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator; χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; 90% CI = 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA; Comp. = Comparison; Δ CFI = change in CFI value compared to the preceding model; Δ TLI = change in the TLI value compared to the preceding model; Δ RMSEA = change in the RMSEA value compared to the preceding model. * $p < .001$

Table S9. Sexual orientation-based descriptive statistics on the Sexual Desire Inventory (SDI-2)

	SDI-2 total score			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
<i>Sexual Orientation</i> ^a				
Gay or lesbian	62.75	17.32	0	101
Homo-and heteroflexible identities	60.70	16.94	0	101
Bisexual	59.78	17.71	0	101
Queer and pansexual	57.51	18.70	0	101
Heterosexual/straight	56.20	18.56	0	101
Questioning	49.17	21.11	0	101
Other	47.42	22.99	0	101
Asexual	18.28	16.86	0	92

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation, Min.=minimum, Max=maximum;

^a=The same genders as in the gender-based measurement invariance tests




Figure S1. Participants distribution according to the age (total Sample [n=82,243])