

## LETTER OF REVIEWERS

---

**Reviewer A:**

**Recommendation: Revisions Required**

---

**Relevance:** Moderated

**Novelty:** Moderated

**Presentation and writing:** Moderated

### Comments for authors:

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting your article entitled "Influence of satisfaction with family life and child-to-parent violence on school satisfaction in secondary school students in Nueva Cajamarca-Peru, 2024" to the "Interacciones: Journal of Family, Clinical and Health Psychology".

The following comments are intended to improve your manuscript and evaluate the validity of the work carried out. Please review and take into consideration each of the comments sent, organized by section, and respond to them by the date indicated to make the necessary changes for further consideration.

Comments:

#### Abstract

1. In your results presented in the abstract, on lines 3-6, there is an inconsistency with the data presented regarding the proportion of women and students living with two parents. Please review this data inconsistency.

#### Introduction

2. Dear authors, your introduction, in my opinion, is too long. Your study should be clear about the problem, a brief description of the problem with previous literature, connecting your independent variables with your dependent variable, the knowledge gap that justifies your study. This should be clear and concise. Your study's response to this knowledge gap should be explained, including its overall objective, proposed design, and expected results. I recommend limiting your introduction to a maximum of four paragraphs. Please be more specific about the studies to include in your brief literature review.

#### Methods

3. Regarding the study design, I consider it a correlational-analytic study, rather than an explanatory design, since a structural model of relationships between variables was tested using SEM. SEM is useful for theoretical testing and association/prediction, not for cross-sectional causality. This is also because no adjustments were made for important covariates in the model, which could have better explained the complex relationship between the variables of interest without the influence of external variables.

#### Statistical Analysis

4. For a confirmatory SEM, an a priori sample size/power analysis is expected—either RMSEA-based (MacCallum's approach with specified df,  $\alpha$ , and target power) or Monte Carlo targeting the anticipated loadings and path effects. If the sample was collected by convenience sampling without prior calculation, please provide a sensitivity/Monte Carlo analysis showing the smallest path coefficients and model-fit thresholds the study is adequately powered to detect, and discuss this as a limitation if power is inadequate for small effects.

5. In the participants section, is the school you selected a public or private institution? Is it located in a rural or urban area? Describe this in the corresponding section.

6. What was the student non-response rate? This should be clearly reported. What characteristics did the excluded students have? What were their reasons for not participating in this study? This should be clearly described in its methodology.

7. What were the eligibility criteria for choosing this school? This should be clearly described.
8. In the first line of the second paragraph of the participants section. The SD of the average age seems very wide. Could you please corroborate this information?
9. I recommend moving this second paragraph from the participants section to the first results section, along with Table 1.
10. In the procedures section, line 7 of the paragraph states “to respond to the survey, students entered in groups per classroom.” It is very likely that there is a within-classroom correlation that limits the inference if it was not analytically adjusted, as it can lead to an overestimation of significance. If so, it should be reported as a limitation.
11. Ethical aspects: review the last line of the paragraph; it has a grammatical error.

#### Results

12. In the second results paragraph, the last two lines describe “); on the other hand, satisfaction with family life moderately and directly related to ( $r = 0.382$  to  $r = 0.433$ ) (Table 3).” Complete the sentence.
13. In paragraph 3 of the results, lines 3 to 5 state, “School satisfaction is defined by five indicators with high factor loadings, such as suitability of choice ( $\lambda = 0.23$ ), quality of school services ( $\lambda = 0.21$ ), relationships with peers ( $\lambda = 0.89$ ), effectiveness of study habits ( $\lambda = 0.90$ ), and usefulness for a future career ( $\lambda = 0.18$ ).” However, three indicators have  $\lambda = 0.18, 0.21,$  and  $0.23$ , which are too low to be considered good indicators (typically  $\geq 0.40-0.50$ ). Please review the wording.
14. In the caption of Figure 1, please review the abbreviation CA; it does not match the figure.

#### Discussion

15. Regarding the limitations and strengths of your study, what impact might not have come from not including covariates in your analytical model? What was the reason for not including them in the analytical model, and what impact might this have on your results? Although you acknowledge this decision as a limitation, I believe it greatly limits your findings, considering the influence that other important variables in your study sample may have.
16. In lines 7-8 of the limitations and strengths section, you describe “a representative sample by sex could be obtained thanks to the administrative support of the educational authorities.” What do you mean by this? It is good to specify to avoid confusion regarding the possibility that a group of students with other characteristics could have been introduced to intentionally balance the sex of the sample

**Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

Yes, I agree to have my name indicated as a reviewer.

-----  
**Reviewer B:**

**Recommendation: Revisions Required**  
-----

**Relevance:** Very high

**Novelty:** Very high

**Presentation and writing:** Very high

#### Comments for authors:

Page 5, paragraph 5, line 2: Write out the abbreviation in full, as this is the first time it is mentioned (The structural equation model, SEM).

Page 5, Statistical Analysis section: Briefly explain what the SEM aims to describe and specify the variables included. It would also be valuable to briefly justify the choice of the statistical tests used.

Page 7, paragraph 1, line 1: At this point, it may no longer be necessary to spell out the abbreviation again (SEM).

Page 8, paragraphs 2 and 3: Style suggestion; both paragraphs begin with “Likewise”, it is recommended to vary the connector to avoid repetition.

Page 9, first line: A capital letter is missing at the beginning of the sentence.

Page 9, paragraph 4: Indentation is missing at the beginning of the paragraph.

**Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

Yes, I agree to have my name indicated as a reviewer.

-----  
**Reviewer C:**  
**Recommendation: Revisions Required**  
-----

**Relevance:** High

**Novelty:** Moderated

**Presentation and writing:** High

**Comments for authors:**

1. Observaciones sobre el contenido:

- Considero que el título puede acortarse. En el texto, el lector podrá enterarse que se trata de estudiantes de Nueva Cajamarca y que los datos se recogieron en 2024.
- ¿De qué manera investigar el problema propuesto permitiría implementar programas de intervención? Esto se afirma casi al final de la introducción sin dar mayor detalle al respecto, es necesario exponerlo.
- Si algunos de los resultados obtenidos guardan similitud con los de otros estudios, ¿qué agrega esta investigación de novedoso?, ¿es acaso la muestra? (antes no había sido estudiado con chicos peruanos), ¿es el hecho de que las variables específicas aquí examinadas no habían sido incluidas anteriormente en los estudios? Como quiera que sea, esto debe hacerse explícito en la introducción del trabajo.
- En el apartado de fortalezas y limitaciones, se afirma que la muestra fue representativa con respecto al sexo de los participantes. Diría que fue equitativa, pero no necesariamente representativa.

2. He realizado una serie de comentarios cuyas indicaciones buscan mejorar la redacción (ver archivo adjunto).

3. Asimismo, he hecho varias observaciones en el texto del artículo con respecto al cumplimiento de las normas de presentación. Específicamente, se requieren ciertos elementos para adecuar tablas, figuras y abreviaturas estadísticas según normas APA. De la misma forma, hay elementos faltantes o innecesarios en las entradas de la lista de referencias. Por último, es muy importante la correspondencia entre citas y referencias. Detecté que hay referencias que no aparecen en las citas:

- Ato, M., López-García, J. J., & Benavente, A. (2013).
- Ayllón, V. E. C., Molina, J. V., Gamarra, P. del P. D., Quiñones, A. del R. C., & Alomía, E. R. E. (2019).
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. (2018).
- Oyarzún Gómez, D., Casas Aznar, F., & Alfaro Inzunza, J. (2019).

De igual manera, la cita de Gravetter & Forzano (2018) no aparece en la lista de referencias.

**Interacciones seeks greater transparency in the review process and to provide credit to reviewers. If the editors decide to accept the manuscript, would you like your name to appear as a reviewer of the article?**

Yes, I agree to have my name indicated as a reviewer.

## RESPONSE LETTER

**Subject:** Response Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor,

We sincerely thank you and the reviewers for your evaluation of our manuscript entitled “**Influence of satisfaction with family life and child-to-parent violence on school satisfaction in secondary school students**” (ID: 476). Your comments have been invaluable in improving the quality and clarity of our work.

We carefully reviewed each of the comments and made the corresponding revisions to the manuscript. All comments have been addressed and incorporated into the revised version. We believe these changes have strengthened the manuscript and hope that the new version meets the journal's editorial standards.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**The Authors**

### Below, we present our response to the comments:

#### 1. Abstract

In your results presented in the abstract, on lines 3-6, there is an inconsistency with the data presented regarding the proportion of women and students living with two parents. Please review this data inconsistency.

**There was indeed an error in the data presented, which has now been corrected.**

#### Introduction

2. Dear authors, your introduction, in my opinion, is too long. Your study should be clear about the problem, a brief description of the problem with previous literature, connecting your independent variables with your dependent variable, the knowledge gap that justifies your study. This should be clear and concise. Your study's response to this knowledge gap should be explained, including its overall objective, proposed design, and expected results. I recommend limiting your introduction to a maximum of four paragraphs. Please be more specific about the studies to include in your brief literature review.

**Thank you for your feedback. In response, the introduction has been revised and restructured, reducing its length to a maximum of four paragraphs to clearly and concisely present the research problem. The revised version synthesizes the most relevant previous literature, explicitly establishing the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as well as the knowledge gap that justifies the study, especially within the Latin American context. The overall objective of the study, the proposed methodological design, and the expected results have also been explicitly included.**

#### Methods

3. Regarding the study design, I consider it a correlational-analytic study, rather than an explanatory design, since a structural model of relationships between variables was tested using SEM. SEM is useful for theoretical testing and association/prediction, not for cross-sectional causality. This is also because no adjustments were made for important covariates in the model, which could have better explained the complex relationship between the variables of interest without the influence of external variables.

**The study design was corrected in the methodology section.**

#### Statistical Analysis

4. For a confirmatory SEM, an a priori sample size/power analysis is expected—either RMSEA-based (MacCallum's approach with specified df,  $\alpha$ , and target power) or Monte Carlo targeting the anticipated loadings and path effects. If the sample was collected by convenience sampling without prior calculation, please provide a sensitivity/Monte Carlo analysis showing the smallest path coefficients and model-fit thresholds the study is adequately powered to detect, and discuss this as a limitation if power is inadequate for small effects.

**The sample size was estimated using power analysis based on the overall RMSEA of the SEM model, considering an expected RMSEA = 0.05,  $\alpha$  = 0.05, power = 0.80, and 13 degrees of freedom derived from the specified model. The results indicated a minimum sample size of n = 434 to detect an adequate model fit; however, considering a 10% dropout rate, the recommended sample size was 483 participants; nevertheless, our sample size was even larger = 497. Digital calculator:**

**<https://wnarifin.ocpu.io/sscalc/www/ssrmsea.html>**

5. In the participants section, is the school you selected a public or private institution? Is it located in a rural or urban area? Describe this in the corresponding section.

**Thank you for the observation; this has been included in the manuscript.**

6. What was the student non-response rate? This should be clearly reported. What characteristics did the excluded students have? What were their reasons for not participating in this study? This should be clearly described in its methodology.

**This data was included in the manuscript.**

7. What were the eligibility criteria for choosing this school? This should be clearly described.

**This information has been explicitly included in the participants section. Thank you for pointing it out.**

8. In the first line of the second paragraph of the participants section. The SD of the average age seems very wide. Could you please corroborate this information?

**We appreciate the observation and have verified the information in the original database, confirming that the standard deviation of age (SD = 6.34) is correct. This value is explained by the wide age range of the participants, which includes students from different grades of secondary education, thus increasing the variability in age.**

9. I recommend moving this second paragraph from the participants section to the first results section, along with Table 1.

**The recommendation was taken into account and the section was moved to the results section.**

10. In the procedures section, line 7 of the paragraph states "to respond to the survey, students entered in groups per classroom." It is very likely that there is a within-classroom correlation that limits the inference if it was not analytically adjusted, as it can lead to an overestimation of significance. If so, it should be reported as a limitation.

**We appreciate the observation made; however, although the survey was administered to students organized by classroom, the analysis was conducted at the individual level, and no analytical adjustments were made for clusters. Therefore, this situation has been explicitly included as a limitation of the study in the manuscript.**

11. Ethical aspects: review the last line of the paragraph; it has a grammatical error.

**Thanks, the grammar was corrected.**

#### Results

12. In the second results paragraph, the last two lines describe "..."; on the other hand, satisfaction with family life moderately and directly related to ( $r = 0.382$  to  $r = 0.433$ ) (Table 3)." Complete the sentence.

**The interpretation of Table 3 has been updated, thank you very much.**

13. In paragraph 3 of the results, lines 3 to 5 state, "School satisfaction is defined by five indicators with high factor loadings, such as suitability of choice ( $\lambda = 0.23$ ), quality of school services ( $\lambda = 0.21$ ), relationships with peers ( $\lambda = 0.89$ ), effectiveness of study habits ( $\lambda = 0.90$ ), and usefulness for a future career ( $\lambda = 0.18$ )." However, three indicators have  $\lambda = 0.18$ ,  $0.21$ , and  $0.23$ , which are too low to be considered good indicators (typically  $\geq 0.40$ – $0.50$ ). Please review the wording.

**It has been updated to the interpretation of Figure 1 that is described in paragraph 4 of the results section.**

"The structural equation modeling (SEM) shows that satisfaction with family life has a positive and significant effect on school satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.42$ ), while violence from children to parents has a negative effect ( $\beta = -0.14$ ). School satisfaction is defined as a latent construct measured by five indicators, all of which have high factor loadings, demonstrating adequate representation of the construct. Specifically, usefulness for a future career, effectiveness of study habits, and relationships with peers show factor loadings of  $\lambda = 0.90$ , while the quality of school services ( $\lambda = 0.89$ ) and the suitability of the school choice ( $\lambda = 0.88$ ) also have high values. Overall, these results indicate adequate convergent validity of the measurement model. Furthermore, the overall fit indices reflect an excellent fit of the model to the data (CFI = 0.999, TLI = 1.009, RMSEA = 0.000, 90% CI = 0.000–0.022, SRMR = 0.009), which supports the suitability of the proposed structure (Figure 1)."

14. In the caption of Figure 1, please review the abbreviation CA; it does not match the figure.

**CA has been updated to AC, thank you very much.**

#### Discussion

15. Regarding the limitations and strengths of your study, what impact might not have come from not including covariates in your analytical model? What was the reason for not including them in the analytical model, and what impact might this have on your results? Although you acknowledge this decision as a limitation, I believe it greatly limits your findings, considering the influence that other important variables in your study sample may have.

Thank you for the recommendation, we have updated it.

16. In lines 7-8 of the limitations and strengths section, you describe “a representative sample by sex could be obtained thanks to the administrative support of the educational authorities.” What do you mean by this? It is good to specify to avoid confusion regarding the possibility that a group of students with other characteristics could have been introduced to intentionally balance the sex of the sample  
We did indeed make a clerical error when writing that; this section has been updated removing the indicated error.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----  
Page 5, paragraph 5, line 2: Write out the abbreviation in full, as this is the first time it is mentioned (The structural equation model, SEM).

The request on page 4, line 124 was implemented.

Page 5, Statistical Analysis section: Briefly explain what the SEM aims to describe and specify the variables included. It would also be valuable to briefly justify the choice of the statistical tests used.

The request on page 4, lines 123 to 136 was implemented.

Page 7, paragraph 1, line 1: At this point, it may no longer be necessary to spell out the abbreviation again (SEM).

The update has been implemented

Page 8, paragraphs 2 and 3: Style suggestion; both paragraphs begin with “Likewise”, it is recommended to vary the connector to avoid repetition.

The paragraph connector was changed

Page 9, first line: A capital letter is missing at the beginning of the sentence.

The requested action was implemented.

Page 9, paragraph 4: Indentation is missing at the beginning of the paragraph.

The requested action was implemented.

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Observaciones sobre el contenido:

- Considero que el título puede acortarse. En el texto, el lector podrá enterarse que se trata de estudiantes de Nueva Cajamarca y que los datos se recogieron en 2024.

Agradecemos su recomendación, se ha actualizado el título

- ¿De qué manera investigar el problema propuesto permitiría implementar programas de intervención? Esto se afirma casi al final de la introducción sin dar mayor detalle al respecto, es necesario exponerlo.

Se ha implementado en las líneas 72 a 76

- Si algunos de los resultados obtenidos guardan similitud con los de otros estudios, ¿qué agrega esta investigación de novedoso?, ¿es acaso la muestra? (antes no había sido estudiado con chicos peruanos), ¿es el hecho de que las variables específicas aquí examinadas no habían sido incluidas anteriormente en los estudios? Como quiera que sea, esto debe hacerse explícito en la introducción del trabajo.

Se ha implementado en las líneas 72 a 76

- En el apartado de fortalezas y limitaciones, se afirma que la muestra fue representativa con respecto al sexo de los participantes. Diría que fue equitativa, pero no necesariamente representativa.

Agradecemos la observación, en efecto consideramos quitar esa limitación y se actualizaron.

2. He realizado una serie de comentarios cuyas indicaciones buscan mejorar la redacción (ver archivo adjunto).

Agradecemos, hemos levantado las observaciones

3. Asimismo, he hecho varias observaciones en el texto del artículo con respecto al cumplimiento de las normas de presentación. Específicamente, se requieren ciertos elementos para adecuar tablas, figuras y abreviaturas estadísticas según normas APA. De la misma forma, hay elementos faltantes o innecesarios en las entradas de la lista de referencias.

Agradecemos, hemos levantado las observaciones

Por último, es muy importante la correspondencia entre citas y referencias. Detecté que hay referencias que no aparecen en las citas:

Rodríguez Guevara, M., Mendoza Castro, G. A., Richard Pérez, S. E., & Cjuno, J. (2026). Influence of satisfaction with family life and child-parental violence on school satisfaction among Peruvian high school students. *Interacciones*, 12, e476.  
<https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.476>

- Ato, M., López-García, J. J., & Benavente, A. (2013).
- Ayllón, V. E. C., Molina, J. V., Gamarra, P. del P. D., Quiñones, A. del R. C., & Alomía, E. R. E. (2019).
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. (2018).
- Oyarzún Gómez, D., Casas Aznar, F., & Alfaro Inzunza, J. (2019).

**Se eliminaron de las referencias**

De igual manera, la cita de Gravetter & Forzano (2018) no aparece en la lista de referencias.

**Se añadió en las referencias**