

LETTER OF REVIEWERS (ROUND 1)

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

Relevance: Moderated

Novelty: Moderated

Presentation and writing: Low or very low

Comments for authors:

Title and Abstract:

1. Title: It is recommended to specify the type of design. For example: The influence of harmonious parent-child relationships on the development of a mentally healthy personality: A qualitative study in healthcare professionals.

It should be noted that the term "mentally healthy personality" is not a scientific construct as such, so it is advisable to improve the clarity of the title.

2. Abstract: In the objective subsection, it could be mentioned that the study is conducted from the perspective of healthcare workers. Additionally, there is no clear methods section in the abstract. Please add a methods section to the abstract.

Introduction:

1. Theoretical justification: It would be beneficial for the authors to include a more in-depth discussion of the specific gaps in the literature that this study seeks to address. Although it mentions that strategies to foster these relationships are not fully understood, it is unclear which specific aspects the study will investigate.

2. Hypothesis: Hypotheses are not explicitly formulated. It would be advisable for the author(s) to include a clear hypothesis or specific research questions to guide the reader on what the study aims to find.

3. It is unclear why, if the objective of the study is to investigate how harmonious parent-child relationships are generated, it is necessary to interview healthcare workers. This should be explained in greater detail in the introduction.

Method:

1. Study design: The methodological design is not entirely clear in the methods section. It would be helpful to specify whether this is a qualitative design based solely on interviews or if another method was combined. Additionally, if a qualitative design was used, clarify whether a phenomenological or similar approach was applied. The lack of detail on data collection, such as the interview format, limits replicability.

2. Setting: It is suggested to add a section on the setting, describing the characteristics of the population evaluated, as well as the participants' context. For example, indicate in which country and city the evaluation was conducted, describe the working conditions of the healthcare workers, the income level of the country (LMIC, HIC, etc.), and explain the type of healthcare system the participants operate in (e.g., private, public, mixed).

3. Participants: Although a clear description of participants in terms of age and gender is provided, more details on their recruitment (was it random? convenience-based?) and the representativeness of the consulted professionals would be useful. It would also help to give a more detailed explanation of how the number of participants was determined. Was theoretical saturation used, or what method was applied? Additionally, indicate the countries of origin of the healthcare workers.

4. Instruments: The instruments used in the interviews are not thoroughly described, nor is the nature of the questions. It is important to clarify whether a standardized questionnaire was used or if the questions were open-ended. Also, indicate what domains were covered by the interview guide. Specify whether the interview guide was semi-structured, structured, or open-ended. It is suggested to add the interview guide as supplementary material. Additionally, state the average duration of each interview

(e.g., 10 minutes, 50 minutes, 2 hours).

5. Data analysis: The description of the analysis is limited. It would benefit the reader to know the approach used for the analysis of the interviews (Was thematic analysis or content analysis employed?). The lack of detailed explanation makes it difficult to understand the analytical process.

The authors mention "The use of the synthesis method in the study." However, it is unclear what type of analysis was used, so it is suggested to include the reference for the author who proposed that specific analysis.

The authors state, "Based on the method of systematisation, the study identified the features of family therapy, play therapy, cognitive behavioural therapy, and psychoeducation for parents as effective approaches aimed at stimulating harmonious relationships between parents and children." However, this assertion seems to belong in the results section rather than the methods. This issue is repeated in other parts of the methods section. It is recommended that the authors revise and modify the data analysis subsection to only describe the actions taken to analyze the data.

It is suggested that the authors refer to studies that have used the same method or cite the original author of these methods.

Results:

1. Separation of main findings: It is suggested that the authors add subheadings for the main findings, as the reading becomes difficult to follow when distinguishing between the results of the interviews, the authors' statements (without citations), and references to previous studies (with citations).

2. Improve the wording of the results: The current wording includes general statements, and it is unclear which parts are the participants' statements. It is recommended to change the writing style to make it clearer. For example: "The interviewees indicated that..." or "The thematic analysis identified that...". It would also be helpful to include direct quotes from the interviews to help readers grasp the studied phenomenon. In its current state, the results section is not acceptable. This section needs to be completely rewritten, as it is not clear what findings come from the interviews.

3. Use of references in the results: It is uncommon for a qualitative study focused on interviews to include scientific references as part of the results, unless it is specific to the type of analysis. However, this is not the case, as no thematic analysis of scientific documents has been conducted. It is recommended to differentiate the results and discussion sections, and to remove references from the results section.

Discussion:

1. Strengths and limitations section: The discussion could benefit from a more critical focus on the results, particularly regarding the study's limitations (for example, not considering the parents' perspective). The limitations of the study are not explicitly mentioned. It is crucial that the author(s) address the lack of diversity in the participants (all mental health professionals) and how this may affect the generalization of the results. It should be noted that the most important strength, in my opinion, is the large number of interviews conducted.

2. Comparison with other studies: There is adequate comparison with previous studies, although it would be interesting to include more details on how this study's results uniquely contribute to the field.

General Recommendations:

1. Clarify and elaborate on the methodological section, including a more detailed description of the instruments and data analysis.

2. Explicitly formulate hypotheses or research questions.

3. Include a more explicit discussion of the study's limitations and suggestions for future research.

4. Improve the wording of the results and structure the section based on the statements of the interviewees and the findings of the qualitative analysis.

RESPONSE LETTER (ROUND 1)

Respected Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for providing such a detailed and thoughtful review of our manuscript submitted to "Interacciones." I appreciate the time and effort you put into offering valuable feedback, which has been crucial in improving the quality of the work. I have carefully addressed all of your suggestions and made the necessary revisions, with changes highlighted in blue for your convenience. Your insights have significantly enhanced the clarity and substance of the research. I am grateful for your expertise and the thorough review you conducted. Thank you once again for your time and for helping to elevate the overall quality of the manuscript.

Response to the Reviewer 1:

Title and Abstract:

Comment: Title: It is recommended to specify the type of design. For example: The influence of harmonious parent-child relationships on the development of a mentally healthy personality: A qualitative study in healthcare professionals. It should be noted that the term "mentally healthy personality" is not a scientific construct as such, so it is advisable to improve the clarity of the title.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback regarding the title. The author has revised the title to specify the type of design, as suggested. The new title is: "The Impact of Harmonious Parent-Child Relationships on the Development of Psychological Well-Being and Personality Resilience: A qualitative study in healthcare professionals." I have acknowledged that the term "mentally healthy personality" is not a scientific construct and have improved the clarity of the title accordingly.

Comment: Abstract: In the objective subsection, it could be mentioned that the study is conducted from the perspective of healthcare workers. Additionally, there is no clear methods section in the abstract. Please add a methods section to the abstract.

Response: In response to your comments on the abstract, the author has updated the objective subsection to specify that the study is conducted from the perspective of healthcare workers: "The purpose of this study was to...". Furthermore, a clear methods section has been added to the abstract, outlining the design and methodology employed in the study: "Qualitative and quantitative methods, including...".

Introduction:

Comment: Theoretical justification: It would be beneficial for the authors to include a more in-depth discussion of the specific gaps in the literature that this study seeks to address. Although it mentions that strategies to foster these relationships are not fully understood, it is unclear which specific aspects the study will investigate.

Response: The author has revised the introduction to include a more in-depth discussion of the specific gaps in the literature that the study aims to address. The revised introduction now clearly outlines the particular aspects of parent-child relationships that are underexplored, including the lack of understanding about effective strategies for fostering these relationships: "Contemporary families face numerous challenges...".

Comment: Hypothesis: Hypotheses are not explicitly formulated. It would be advisable for the author(s) to include a clear hypothesis or specific research questions to guide the reader on what the study aims to find.

Response: In response to your comment about the hypothesis, the author has now included a clear hypothesis and specific research questions in the introduction. These additions provide a focused direction for the study and clarify what the research aims to uncover regarding harmonious parent-child relationships: "In this study, the author has a specific hypothesis...".

Comment: It is unclear why, if the objective of the study is to investigate how harmonious parent-child

relationships are generated, it is necessary to interview healthcare workers. This should be explained in greater detail in the introduction.

Response: The aims has been updated to explain in greater detail why this perspective is critical. The revised text clarifies that healthcare workers, with their professional experience, offer unique insights into the practical aspects of parent-child relationships and the impact of these relationships on mental health: "The survey of medical professionals is important...".

Method:

Comment: Study design: The methodological design is not entirely clear in the methods section. It would be helpful to specify whether this is a qualitative design based solely on interviews or if another method was combined. Additionally, if a qualitative design was used, clarify whether a phenomenological or similar approach was applied. The lack of detail on data collection, such as the interview format, limits replicability.

Response: I have revised the methods section to clearly specify that the study utilized a qualitative design based solely on interviews. Author have also clarified that a phenomenological approach was applied to gain insights into participants' experiences. Researcher have provided detailed information on the interview format, including the structure and nature of the questions, to improve replicability: "The methodological design of the study...".

Comment: Setting: It is suggested to add a section on the setting, describing the characteristics of the population evaluated, as well as the participants' context. For example, indicate in which country and city the evaluation was conducted, describe the working conditions of the healthcare workers, the income level of the country (LMIC, HIC, etc.), and explain the type of healthcare system the participants operate in (e.g., private, public, mixed).

Response: Now this section includes details on the country and city where the study was conducted, the working conditions of the healthcare workers, the income level of the country (classified as HIC), and the type of healthcare system in which the participants operate (mixed public-private system): "The study was conducted in the city...".

Comment: Participants: Although a clear description of participants in terms of age and gender is provided, more details on their recruitment (was it random? convenience-based?) and the representativeness of the consulted professionals would be useful. It would also help to give a more detailed explanation of how the number of participants was determined. Was theoretical saturation used, or what method was applied? Additionally, indicate the countries of origin of the healthcare workers.

Response: I have expanded the description of participants to include more details on their recruitment method, which was convenience-based. Author also provided a more detailed explanation of how the number of participants was determined, noting that theoretical saturation was used. The countries of origin of the healthcare workers have been specified in the revised methods section: "The participants in the study were selected...".

Comment: Instruments: The instruments used in the interviews are not thoroughly described, nor is the nature of the questions. It is important to clarify whether a standardized questionnaire was used or if the questions were open-ended. Also, indicate what domains were covered by the interview guide. Specify whether the interview guide was semi-structured, structured, or open-ended. It is suggested to add the interview guide as supplementary material. Additionally, state the average duration of each interview (e.g., 10 minutes, 50 minutes, 2 hours).

Response: The revised methods section now includes a thorough description of the instruments used during the interviews. Researcher clarified that open-ended questions were employed and provided details on the domains covered by the interview guide. The guide was semi-structured, and I have included the average duration of each interview: "The interviews utilized semi-structured tools that...".

Comment: Data analysis: The description of the analysis is limited. It would benefit the reader to know the approach used for the analysis of the interviews (Was thematic analysis or content analysis employed?). The lack of detailed explanation makes it difficult to understand the analytical process.

Response: I have elaborated on the data analysis process, specifying that I employed thematic analysis to examine the interviews. The revised description now provides a clear and detailed explanation of how I analyzed and categorized the data: "During the analysis of the interviews..."

Comment: The authors mention "The use of the synthesis method in the study." However, it is unclear what type of analysis was used, so it is suggested to include the reference for the author who proposed that specific analysis.

Response: Thank you for your feedback. I have clarified that the type of analysis used in the study is thematic analysis. I believe that specifying the method as thematic analysis provides adequate detail for understanding the analytical process, without requiring additional references or information on the authorship of this method: "During the analysis of the interviews, thematic..."

Comment: The authors state, "Based on the method of systematisation, the study identified the features of family therapy, play therapy, cognitive behavioural therapy, and psychoeducation for parents as effective approaches aimed at stimulating harmonious relationships between parents and children." However, this assertion seems to belong in the results section rather than the methods. This issue is repeated in other parts of the methods section. It is recommended that the authors revise and modify the data analysis subsection to only describe the actions taken to analyze the data. It is suggested that the authors refer to studies that have used the same method or cite the original author of these methods.

Response: I have revised the data analysis section to focus exclusively on the methods used to analyze the data. The claims about the features of different therapeutic approaches have been moved to the results section. Additionally, I have cited relevant studies that have used similar methods and referred to the original authors to provide context and support for my analysis: "Based on the method of systematisation, the..."

Results:

Comment: Separation of main findings: It is suggested that the authors add subheadings for the main findings, as the reading becomes difficult to follow when distinguishing between the results of the interviews, the authors' statements (without citations), and references to previous studies (with citations).

Response: Subheadings have been added to clearly distinguish the main findings, making it easier to follow the results of the interviews, the authors' statements, and references to previous studies: "Mental Health in Childhood and Its Long-Term Impact", "Challenges in Time Management and Parental Control" ...

Comment: Improve the wording of the results: The current wording includes general statements, and it is unclear which parts are the participants' statements. It is recommended to change the writing style to make it clearer. For example: "The interviewees indicated that..." or "The thematic analysis identified that...". It would also be helpful to include direct quotes from the interviews to help readers grasp the studied phenomenon. In its current state, the results section is not acceptable. This section needs to be completely rewritten, as it is not clear what findings come from the interviews.

Response: The wording of the results section has been revised to clarify which parts reflect participants' statements and which are based on the thematic analysis. Direct quotes from the interviews have been included to better illustrate the findings. The rewritten parts of the Results section are highlighted in blue.

Comment: Use of references in the results: It is uncommon for a qualitative study focused on interviews to include scientific references as part of the results, unless it is specific to the type of analysis. However, this is not the case, as no thematic analysis of scientific documents has been conducted. It is recommended to differentiate the results and discussion sections, and to remove references from the results section.

Response: References have been removed from the results section. The results and discussion sections have been differentiated to adhere to the conventions of qualitative research, focusing the results section solely on the findings from the interviews.

Discussion:

Comment: Strengths and limitations section: The discussion could benefit from a more critical focus on the results, particularly regarding the study's limitations (for example, not considering the parents' perspective). The limitations of the study are not explicitly mentioned. It is crucial that the author(s) address the lack of diversity in the participants (all mental health professionals) and how this may affect the generalization of the results. It should be noted that the most important strength, in my opinion, is the large number of interviews conducted.

Response: The discussion now includes a critical examination of the study's limitations, particularly the lack of consideration for parents' perspectives. I have explicitly addressed the issue of participant diversity, noting that the study's focus on mental health professionals may affect the generalizability of the results. The discussion also highlights the strength of having conducted a large number of interviews: "One of the main limitations of the study is...".

Comment: Comparison with other studies: There is adequate comparison with previous studies, although it would be interesting to include more details on how this study's results uniquely contribute to the field.

Response: I have expanded the comparison with previous studies, providing more details on how the results of this study uniquely contribute to the field: "The results of this study make a unique contribution...".

General Recommendations:

Comment: Clarify and elaborate on the methodological section, including a more detailed description of the instruments and data analysis.

Response: The methodological section has been clarified and elaborated upon. It now includes a more detailed description of the instruments used and the data analysis process: "The interviews utilized semi-structured tools ...".

Comment: Explicitly formulate hypotheses or research questions.

Response: Clear hypotheses and research questions have been explicitly formulated to guide the study and provide a focused direction for the research: "In this study, the author has a specific...".

Comment: Include a more explicit discussion of the study's limitations and suggestions for future research.

Response: A more explicit discussion of the study's limitations has been included, along with suggestions for future research to address these limitations: "One of the main limitations of the study...".

Comment: Improve the wording of the results and structure the section based on the statements of the interviewees and the findings of the qualitative analysis.

Response: The wording of the results has been improved, and the section has been restructured to clearly differentiate between the statements of the interviewees and the findings from the qualitative analysis.

LETTER OF REVIEWERS (ROUND 2)

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High

Novelty: Moderated

Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:

Major Comments

1. It is necessary to add a section titled "Ethical Aspects," explicitly stating that participants provided written informed consent and that the protocol was approved by the ethics committee (Code, Committee name). If interviews were recorded, it should be explicitly mentioned that participants also consented to the recording.

2. The previous version of the manuscript had a methods section that was somewhat disorganized and difficult to follow, as certain concepts were introduced at the beginning and revisited later on. A proposed structure, sent in the attached document, is suggested for the next version, with minor changes introduced in wording to make the manuscript clearer. In this new version, sections were reorganized following the "Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research" standard.

3. I suggest that the manuscript explicitly refers to and cites that it follows the "Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research" standard, as it enables a better report of qualitative studies.

4. Upon reorganizing the methods section, I noticed that the data analysis section is repetitive and makes statements that lack supporting citations. I suggest citing the different types of analyses performed. The manuscript implies that various analyses were conducted and that these findings were triangulated. However, this is not currently reflected in the manuscript. I encourage the authors to synthesize the data analysis section, reference the different analyses, and explain concretely how they were conducted and on what basis. Statements like "The use of the synthesis method in the study allowed for a detailed analysis of various aspects of the relationship between parents and children" may emphasize the importance of analysis but distract the reader from more relevant aspects related to study replicability. Therefore, I suggest omitting such statements and focusing concretely on how the analysis was conducted and citing the guidelines/methods used.

5. I suggest attaching the interview guide as supplementary material to provide more evidence for the study's replicability.

6. The results section has significantly improved from the previous version. In the response letter, the authors state that references have been removed from the results section. However, references are still present. I suggest removing the references, as the results section should focus on presenting the study's new evidence and findings. For example: "Childhood is a critical period for developing social skills, emotional resilience, and the ability to adapt to changes in the environment (Mattanah et al., 2011)."

7. The results section needs further clarity. There are still sections that are unclear or overly general. The authors have made a significant effort by interviewing 100 participants, which is uncommon since qualitative samples are typically small. Therefore, I recommend using direct quotations from participants instead of vague statements. For example:

"I think [task-shifting] is a good idea because the closest health worker to the patient is a nurse (...) For us [doctors] it could be up to three months before we see a patient, but nurses see them every month or every time they require it (...), so to me it would be good to use staff closer to the patient" (Clinician-

Spytska, L. (2024). The impact of harmonious parent-child relationships on the development of psychological well-being and personality resilience: A qualitative study in healthcare professionals. *Interacciones*, 10, e427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2024.v10.427>

Family doctor, Peru, 27QHP02).”

In this source: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9163924/>

Here, statements are used to support findings, with participant codes and characteristics provided at the end, in this case, (psychologist, psychiatrist, etc.).

8. In the discussion section, the authors make some statements that lack supporting references. I suggest reviewing the entire section and ensuring that statements not presented as results are properly referenced. For example:

“These findings are consistent with theories of attachment, social learning, socialization of emotions, and the find-remind-and-bind theory – the act of receiving gratitude promotes positive attitudes towards the person giving the gratitude and can lead to increased prosocial behavior. Researchers have also found that childhood gratitude is positively correlated with greater life satisfaction, positive affect, and mental well-being in cross-sectional studies and intervention trials. These results support the expansion and construction theory, the adaptive cycle model, and the schematic hypothesis. The authors propose a new model, according to which children’s gratitude mediates between the factors of parent-child relationships and children’s mental well-being. They also identified several mechanisms that may explain why gratitude is associated with well-being. The proposed model is important for the current scientific literature, as it represents a new synthesis of existing research on child gratitude and will serve as a basis for further research to test potential mechanisms related to the development of child gratitude and its impact on mental well-being.”

9. In the conclusions section, the authors state, “To summarize, family therapy, play therapy, CBT, and parental psychological education are effective methods for promoting harmonious parent-child relationships aimed at preserving the child’s mental well-being.” However, this has not been the primary objective of the findings. Although the interviewees referred to these interventions, this study did not evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions. I suggest changing the tone of the statement to something like, “The interviewees noted that these interventions...”

10. In the strengths and limitations section, it is unclear what the study's strengths are.

RESPONSE LETTER (ROUND 2)

Respected Editors and Reviewers,

I sincerely appreciate the time and thoughtful feedback you provided on my manuscript for *Interacciones*. Your detailed and constructive comments have been incredibly helpful in enhancing the quality of the paper. Thanks to your suggestions, I have made significant improvements to both the content and structure of the manuscript. I have carefully addressed all of your questions and recommendations, and I am confident that these revisions have strengthened the scientific rigor of the research. For your convenience, all changes have been highlighted in blue, and I have ensured that your points are fully incorporated, making the results more accurate and comprehensive.

Response to the Reviewers:

1. I have added a dedicated section titled "Ethical Aspects" as requested. In this section, we explicitly state that participants provided written informed consent and that the protocol was approved by the ethics committee (Code, Committee name). Additionally, we have mentioned that if interviews were recorded, participants gave their consent to the recordings: "This study adhered to ethical guidelines for...".
2. Author have reorganized the methods section according to the proposed structure you provided, making sure to implement the suggested changes in wording to enhance clarity. The new structure follows the "Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research" standard, as you recommended: "To analyze the data, a thematic method was used...".
3. The manuscript now explicitly refers to the "Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research" standard, and we have cited it accordingly to demonstrate our adherence to these guidelines for qualitative study reporting: "Study follows the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research...".
4. I have reviewed and revised the data analysis section to avoid repetition and to ensure that statements are supported by proper citations. We have synthesized the data analysis section and referenced the different types of analyses conducted, clearly explaining how they were performed and on what basis. We have removed the vague statements, focusing instead on the specific methods and guidelines used for the analysis.
5. Researcher have attached the interview guide as supplementary material to the manuscript to provide additional evidence for the study's replicability: "The interviews were conducted to collect information...".
6. I have removed all references from the results section, as per your suggestion. The section now solely focuses on presenting the study's new evidence and findings without external citations.
7. To address the lack of clarity, we have included direct quotations from participants to support our findings. The revised results section now presents participant quotes with corresponding participant codes and characteristics, as you recommended, providing concrete evidence to back the findings.
8. I have carefully reviewed the discussion section and added supporting references where necessary. All claims and interpretations that are not directly based on the findings have been appropriately referenced: "Obeldobel and Kerns (2021) focus on the importance of personal positive...", "According to Conway et al. (2020), children who experience...", "Teufl and Ahnert (2022) highlight that the types..."
9. I have revised the tone of the statement in the conclusions section. The sentence has been changed to reflect the study's focus: "The interviewees noted that family therapy, play therapy..."
10. Researcher have revised the strengths and limitations section to explicitly outline the strengths of the study. The manuscript now clearly presents the strengths alongside the limitations, providing a balanced view of the study's contributions: "One of the main strengths of this study is the...", "A major limitation of this study is that..."