LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Very high
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: Low or very low

Comments for authors:

1. It is admirable that you are reviewing the current recommendations for sampling and sample size determinations in family clinical and health psychology. I am interested in the mathematics (and techniques of) sampling and sample size determination, but no great authoritative expertise. I am therefore a reader who read your paper hoping to be enlightened and inspired. I think the idea is publishable but a substantial re-write and thought are needed. I learnt a few things but found the paper somewhat verbose and repatative seeming to promise to deliver a lot but delivering little. It is paramount that each sentence says something that is meaningful for the reader to remember, perhaps setting the scene for a point that might otherwise be easily misinterpreted. I found a paper published in December 2024 called " How to choose a sampling technique and determine sample size for research: a simplified guide for researchers": https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oor.2024.100662 by Sirwan Ahmed. I do not consider this to be extremely well written, but I did find that it was clear in many areas, and more informative than your paper. You may find this helpful in providing some structure and clarity for your project. I also asked Chat GPT to sketch out a paper on sampling methodologies and sample size determination in the fields you are interested in and once more I learnt more than was in your paper.

2. In summary, I think you are half way to getting your heads around the important issues that researchers struggle with in determining a sampling technique and size. Do not give up but consider a rewrite with a stronger structure.

3. Well done for choosing this important educational topic for your peers.

4. I think the topic is immensely important and poorly understood. The paper needs to make this difficult area easier to understand with better pointers to the different techniques perhaps with a flow chart to help researchers determine what is needed.

5. With your new gained understanding, have you thought of reviewing some important, perhaps well-known studies, and explaining why these studies have used a certain sampling technique and determined their sample size?

RESPONSE LETTER

Letter of response to reviewers (ID-447)

The changes made according to the reviewers' suggestions are highlighted in the manuscript, and are detailed below for a more precise reference:

1. In the abstract, the introduction, objective, method, results and conclusions sections were added, as well as in the overall structure of the document.
2. The study design was added as a theoretical type in the form of a narrative review and the implications of this design were pointed out (Ato et al., 2013).
3. A flow chart and summary table (appendices 3 and 4) were included on the considerations to be taken into account when estimating the sample size.
4. Regarding the debate on p-hacking and HARKing, we consider that a deeper statistical analysis of such elements exceeds the objectives and scope of our study; however, it is intended for a future study properly directed to statistical issues of the methods.
5. Added content related to the implications of demographic heterogeneity, cultural context and sociopolitical conditions in relation to sampling decisions.

That is all we have to say, and we thank you for your suggestions for the improvement of the manuscript.

Sincerely,

The authors.