

Exploring the Components of Subjective Well-Being Among Individuals Living in Urban Stressful Environments

Jiantang. Yang^{1*}, Parichehr, Mehdiabadi², Anni. Kröger³


¹ Coventry University London–University House, UK

² MSc Student, School of Psychology, University of East London, London, UK



³ Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, University Medical Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

* Corresponding author email address: jian.yang@sheffield.ac.uk

Editor

Sennur Tutarel Kışlak
Department of Psychology/Faculty of Language, History and Geography, University of Ankara, Ankara, Turkey
kislak@ankara.edu.tr

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca
Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While this statement is accurate, the introduction could benefit from a clearer conceptual definition of “subjective well-being” to anchor the reader before reviewing studies.

The flow of literature review is good, but transitions between studies on different groups (housewives, students, nurses, postpartum women) feel abrupt. Consider synthesizing findings more thematically rather than population-by-population.

The use of participant quotes is excellent. However, please add brief identifiers (e.g., Participant 4, female, 34 years) to provide context and credibility.

The link to prior studies is clear, but it would be stronger to discuss how coping strategies in this study differ (e.g., more reliance on environmental escapes such as green spaces) rather than only aligning.

While resilience is presented as transferable, it would be valuable to acknowledge contextual limitations—urban stressors may differ from family caregiving stressors in mechanisms.

While this is noted, a stronger acknowledgment of researcher positionality and how it might have shaped interpretations would increase transparency.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The rationale for the study is sound (“Less is known about the broader lived experiences of urban residents...”). However, the research gap could be made sharper by contrasting what is known about specific subgroups with the absence of holistic urban-focused studies.

The description of Braun and Clarke’s six steps is adequate, but consider briefly explaining how inter-coder reliability or reflexivity was ensured beyond “reflexive memo writing.” Did multiple coders check theme consistency?

The paper highlights urban infrastructure but does not mention policy-level interventions. Suggest expanding to practical recommendations for urban planners.

The discussion could be expanded to include generational differences—did younger vs. older participants describe digital overuse differently?

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. **Revised**

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.