




Ranking Spiritual and Religious Practices Strengthening Family Bonds




Tristan. McKay-Tempest¹, Damián. Cenci Pertile^{2*}, Yirsa. Meza Villanueva³

¹ School of Advanced International Studies Europe, Johns Hopkins University, Bologna, Italy

² Section of Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology, Department of Medicine and Public Health, University of Verona, Ospedale Policlinico “G.B. Rossi”, P.le L.A. Scuro, 10, 37134, Verona, Italy

³ Department of Social Psychology and Quantitative Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Barcelona, 08007 Barcelona, Spain

* Corresponding author email address: damian.pertile@univr.it

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Maximus Monaheng Sefotho  Director of the Neurodiversity Center, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Johannesburg & University of South Africa msefotho@uj.ac.za	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.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 term “spirituality is conceptualized not merely as a set of religious observances but as a multidimensional construct...” would benefit from explicit theoretical references (e.g., Pargament’s model of religious coping). Including seminal frameworks would strengthen conceptual rigor.

The section on “Interfaith Respect and Inclusivity” is insightful but under-theorized. Introduce recent interfaith family models or sociological theories of pluralism to anchor the argument conceptually.

Clarify how integration occurred between qualitative and quantitative phases—was the quantitative instrument validated through pilot testing or expert review? Describe triangulation explicitly.

The use of purposive sampling of “200 adult participants from Italy” requires justification. Explain why Italy was selected, considering its religious demographics. Discuss potential cultural bias or representativeness concerns.

The statement that “interfaith respect... ranked lowest” might appear evaluative. Recommend rephrasing to highlight it as an emerging but underdeveloped dimension rather than a lesser one, to maintain scholarly neutrality.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Consider specifying how cultural context (e.g., Islamic vs. Catholic) influences the relative importance of these rituals. This would add comparative depth.

The statement “Religious education—both formal and informal—shapes the development of faith identity...” summarizes prior research but lacks critical synthesis. Suggest distinguishing between faith instruction and faith socialization processes to clarify mechanisms.

This paragraph could be improved by integrating psychological constructs (e.g., meaning-making, existential well-being) to show how purpose mediates family cohesion.

The description of the literature review (“until theoretical saturation was achieved”) could be more transparent. Specify the number of sources screened, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and whether intercoder reliability was calculated during NVivo analysis.

The authors claim that “ritual participation and moral coherence are central mechanisms” but do not discuss potential confounding variables (e.g., age, denomination, frequency of worship). A regression or subgroup analysis could provide additional insight.

The discussion reiterates descriptive results but could further link findings to moral development theories (e.g., Kohlberg’s stages, Fowler’s faith development) for theoretical depth.

The interpretation of “meaning and purpose orientation” could benefit from connecting findings to existential psychology or family meaning systems theory, which would contextualize results within established psychological literature.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.