




## Exploring the Role of Narrative Reframing in Families Experiencing Trauma

Andreea. Popescu<sup>1</sup>, Mei-Ling. Chen<sup>2\*</sup>, Sharmin. Nasrin<sup>3</sup>


<sup>1</sup> Department of Health Psychology, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

<sup>2</sup> Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan



<sup>3</sup> Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh

\* Corresponding author email address: m.nikolova@nbu.bg

### Editor

Monika Szczygiel  
Department of Psychology,  
Jagiellonian University, Krakow,  
Poland  
monika.szczygiel@uj.edu.pl

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Kamdin. Parsakia  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence, “Trauma within families can emerge from diverse contexts such as war, natural disasters, life-threatening illnesses, loss, or societal crises”, is too broad. Since the sample did not include war-related trauma, consider narrowing or clarifying which types of trauma are the article’s focus.

The sentence, “This study aims to address these gaps by qualitatively exploring how families in Taiwan reconstruct traumatic experiences...” is strong, but the research questions or guiding aims should be explicitly stated for clarity.

The authors state, “A purposive sampling strategy was used to ensure the inclusion of participants who had relevant lived experiences”. Please clarify the specific inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g., type of trauma, time since trauma, language ability).

The subtheme “Intergenerational Hopes” mentions transmitting resilience, but no critical voices are included (e.g., participants who resisted passing trauma narratives). Consider including at least one divergent case for credibility.

The limitation, “Participants may have narrated their experiences in ways they perceived as socially acceptable”, is important. Consider also mentioning the limitation of cross-sectional design (no follow-up interviews) since trauma narratives evolve over time.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement, “The balance between destructive and constructive outcomes often depends on how trauma is communicated...”, is strong. However, no theoretical framework (e.g., Family Systems Theory or Narrative Therapy model) is cited. Adding a theoretical anchor here would improve conceptual depth.

The authors write, “While much literature emphasizes the positive potential of narrative reframing, scholars caution that this process is neither linear nor universally accessible”. Consider expanding this caution with examples of failed or maladaptive reframing to provide balance.

The authors write, “These themes collectively illustrate how Taiwanese families experiencing trauma draw upon narrative processes...”. This summary is clear but repetitive of the results section. Consider reducing overlap and instead expanding theoretical integration.

The paper mentions Korean and Japanese contexts, but does not engage with literature on Chinese or broader East Asian trauma narratives, which would be highly relevant given the Taiwanese focus.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.