

## LETTER OF REVIEWERS

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**Relevance:** Moderated

**Novelty:** Moderated

**Presentation and writing:** Low or very low

### Comments for authors:

1. The journal only accepts manuscripts in English, according to the submission guidelines. Therefore, you must translate the entire letter into English, including the title, the body, and the references (in terms of style).

2. In the body, you state “El objetivo de esta editorial...”. However, this is a letter. I suggest avoiding labeling it as an editorial to prevent confusion for the reader.

3. The text begins with “La salud mental en zonas rurales del Perú requiere algo más que intervenciones bien intencionadas...”. This is a good starting point, but it sounds declarative. What exactly is failing? What correction does the letter propose? What is the consequence if it is not corrected? I suggest rewriting the opening so that it ends with a falsifiable or operational hypothesis. For example, “sin adaptación cultural explícita y evaluación realista, la psicoeducación escolar en zonas rurales corre riesgo de ineficacia o iatrogenia cultural”.

4. The text defends realist evaluation and the CMO model, but it remains at the level of exhortation. The authors state that it is “una herramienta poderosa para estudiar no solo si una intervención funciona, sino cómo, para quién y bajo qué condiciones”. I suggest adding concrete actions (very briefly), for example, requiring that every school-based psychoeducation program report explicit CMOs (mechanism hypotheses) before scaling up. It could also incorporate linguistic and worldview components as “mechanisms” to be tested, rather than as “decorative context”.

5. I suggest avoiding unsupported generalizations. Phrases such as “el incremento de programas... ha sido innegable” may be objectionable if no data are provided (even an approximate indicator or an institutional source). If you do not intend to include an indicator, change to a more cautious formulation.

6. Close with a concrete request (not only exhortation). The current ending is: “Que escuchen sus silencios...”. I suggest closing with an actionable request to the field.

7. There are long passages with multiple subordinate clauses. Divide them into shorter sentences. For example, where you state “El objetivo de esta editorial extiende la defensa...”: separate this into (a) objective, (b) proposal, and (c) contribution.

8. The manuscript contains several spelling errors and minor details that reduce credibility. Correct “porqué/por qué” according to usage, note that “estéril” carries an accent, use “cosmovisiones” and “asimismo”, and check for consistency (“realistas” vs “realista”, “síntesis realista” vs “psicología realista”). In short letters, these details carry more weight.

9. The reference list includes manuals or statistics texts (e.g., Beck 1996, Field 2018) that are not integrated into the argumentative thread of the letter. In a letter format, this may appear as bibliographic “padding”. Retain only what is essential.

## RESPONSE LETTER

### CHANGES IN THE MANUSCRIPT REVIEW

1. The article is being submitted in English in accordance with the guidelines.
2. The corresponding change has been made: it is now a letter reiterating the importance of the topic already addressed in a previous issue.
3. The opening first paragraph has been reorganized, emphasizing the methodological flaw, proposing the correction through consideration of context, and concluding with the formulation of the hypothesis based on the consequences of not addressing the identified problem, namely the methodological aspect. The first paragraph now concludes as follows: "Therefore, we argue that, without explicit cultural adaptation and without realist evaluation based on Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations, school-based psychoeducation in rural areas of Peru risks sustained ineffectiveness or cultural iatrogenesis."
4. In the third paragraph, concrete actions were added to reinforce the importance of the model. These are: "First, that every school-based psychoeducation program explicitly state its CMO hypotheses before implementation or scaling up. Second, that linguistic, cosmovisional, and community components not be treated as decorative context, but as potential mechanisms to be empirically tested. Third, that pilot programs include participatory cultural validation prior to territorial expansion."
5. The phrase "the increase in programs... has been undeniable" has been omitted and replaced with: "The problem is not the existence of programs, but their uncritical extrapolation."
6. The text now concludes with an additional concrete request to the proposals presented in the letter: "If psychoeducation in rural areas aims to be scientifically rigorous and ethically relevant, it must demonstrate not only that it works on average, but how and under what cultural configurations it produces sustainable effects. Realist evaluation is not an optional complement; it is a methodological condition to prevent the invisibilization of Peruvian diversity in applied psychological research."
7. The changes have been made following the structure: (a) objective, (b) proposal, and (c) contribution. It now reads: "The objective of this letter is to defend the relevance of realist evaluation and synthesis, as outlined in a previous editorial. It proposes the use and appraisal of its methodology, according to the conception of Pawson and Tilley (1997), as a powerful tool to study not only whether an intervention works, but how, for whom, and under what conditions. In this way, greater effectiveness in intervention is promoted."
8. Spelling errors have been corrected and coherence throughout the manuscript has been verified.
9. References consisting of manuals and statistical textbooks have been removed.

I would like to acknowledge the merit of the reviewers and would like their names to appear in the article.

**CHANGES IN THE PARAGRAPHS:**

1. In the first paragraph, the opening lines were reformulated to explicitly define the methodological problem. In the seventh line and in the final paragraphs, redundancies were eliminated and emphasis was placed on contextual evaluation.
2. In the second paragraph, lines 4 to 7 were rewritten, condensing the international framework. The last two lines were also removed, eliminating redundancies regarding the importance of the intervention.
3. In the third paragraph, concrete proposals in favor of the use of the model were included in the first eight lines. An additional statement emphasizing the importance of the CMO model was also added.
4. In the final paragraph, modifications were made from the fourth line to the end. All these changes were made with the purpose of including and reinforcing the methodological contribution and scientific agenda in the conclusion..