

Comparison of Parent–Child Relationships, Sense of Coherence, and Psychological Capital among First-Cycle Secondary School Female Students from Only-Child and Multi-Child Families in Khomam

Ghadireh. Baramnia Sarami¹, Samereh. Asadi Majreh^{2*}

¹ Department of Psychology, Ra.C., Islamic Azad University, Rasht, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Ra.C., Islamic Azad University, Rasht, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Samereh.asadi@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić  Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Fahime Bahonar  Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction paragraph stating “Family size is one of the contextual factors that may shape parent–child relational experiences,” the manuscript should present a more balanced theoretical discussion. The current framing tends to suggest that multi-child families are developmentally superior, whereas only-child families may also provide advantages such as greater parental investment, educational support, and emotional availability. A more balanced conceptualization would strengthen the scientific neutrality of the manuscript.

In the introduction paragraph where the authors discuss “Only-child and multi-child families may differ in parental attention, expectations, emotional intensity, sibling interaction, conflict exposure, and opportunities for social learning,” the manuscript should clarify whether these proposed mechanisms are empirically established in the cited literature or are theoretical assumptions. The authors should avoid presenting speculative mechanisms as established findings unless directly supported by the cited studies.

In the final paragraph of the introduction, the sentence “Accordingly, the present study aimed to compare parent–child relationships, sense of coherence, and psychological capital...” is clear, but the introduction should end with a more precise

statement of the research gap immediately before the aim. For example, the authors should explicitly state that few studies have simultaneously compared these three variables between only-child and multi-child female students at the first-cycle secondary level.

In the Parent–Child Relationship Scale paragraph, the sentence “The total score is obtained from the sum of the mean scores of the subscales” requires clarification. If the questionnaire contains 24 items scored on a 7-point scale, the possible score range is 24 to 168; therefore, the authors should specify whether they used raw total scores, subscale sums, or averaged scores. This issue is especially important because some table values appear to be formatted ambiguously.

In the Sense of Coherence Scale paragraph, the scoring description should be revised. The phrase “1 = lack of tendency and 7 = intensity of tendency” is not standard psychometric wording for Likert-type responses in this context. The authors should use a more precise description consistent with the scale manual and clarify whether any SOC-13 items were reverse-scored before calculating the total score.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the methods paragraph beginning “The present study was applied in terms of purpose and descriptive causal-comparative,” the authors should clarify why the design is described as both “descriptive” and “causal-comparative.” These terms may be acceptable in some local methodological traditions, but international readers may find them ambiguous. The authors should explain that the study used a non-experimental comparative design with naturally occurring groups.

In the methods paragraph stating “The statistical population consisted of 988 first-cycle secondary school female students,” the sampling frame needs more detail. The authors should specify the number of schools included, how many schools were randomly selected, whether public and private schools were both included, and whether all seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade students had an equal probability of selection.

In the methods paragraph stating “To estimate the required sample size, GPower software was used based on the effect size, alpha level, and statistical power,” the exact parameters entered into GPower are not reported. The authors should specify the statistical test selected in G*Power, assumed effect size, alpha level, desired power, allocation ratio, and resulting sample size. Without these details, the adequacy and reproducibility of the sample-size calculation cannot be evaluated.

In the methods paragraph stating “the effect size, alpha, and power based on the study... were considered equal to 110,” the wording is statistically incorrect because effect size, alpha, and power cannot collectively be “equal to 110.” The authors should revise this sentence and clearly state that the calculated sample size was 110 participants, while separately reporting the assumed effect size, alpha, and power values.

In the methods paragraph stating “the two groups were matched in terms of educational grade, socioeconomic status, and age range,” the authors should explain the matching procedure. It is unclear whether individual matching, frequency matching, or post hoc equivalence testing was used. The manuscript should also report the statistical evidence showing that the groups did not differ significantly on these demographic variables.

In the data collection tools paragraph for the Parent–Child Relationship Scale, the authors should clarify whether both father and mother forms were administered to all participants and how the total parent–child relationship score was computed. The manuscript currently reports father and mother results separately in some sections but also refers to overall parent–child relationships, which may confuse readers unless scoring procedures are precisely explained.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.