LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: High
Novelty: Moderated
Presentation and writing: High

Comments for authors:

Overall, this is a relevant and well-designed instrumental study that provides additional evidence for the brief ERI in young people from Arequipa, including a comparison of measurement models and tests of sex invariance, which is appropriate.

The introduction is adequate but somewhat lengthy; you could reduce the review of previous Peruvian validations and more clearly emphasize the specific gap addressed by the study and its main objectives/hypotheses.

It would also be useful to place slightly more emphasis on the non-probabilistic sampling strategy and its implications for the generalizability of the findings.

In the Instruments and Data analysis sections, I recommend clarifying why the brief version of the ERI was chosen over other versions, how reverse-coded items were treated, and why the MLR estimator was preferred over other options for Likert-type items, also indicating the software used.

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: High
Novelty: High
Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors:

1. In the Instruments section, add a subheading titled Instruments and include an example of one item.
2. Results
- Regarding content validity, it should be presented narratively; therefore, Table 1 should be removed.
- For the descriptive analyses in Table 2, is there evidence of ceiling or floor effects? Please comment on this.
- In Table 3, use the correct notation for alpha and omega coefficients in accordance with APA guidelines.
- Table 5 must be presented following APA style.
- Since the instrument includes multiple dimensions, the authors should add analyses of HTMT (Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio of Correlations) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Appendix: The authors should create a GitHub account where they upload the dataset and the syntax used for the analyses of internal structure validity, invariance, correlations, and reliability. The link must be included at the end of the manuscript.

To improve the quality of the manuscript, please consider citing high-impact books and journal articles, including their corresponding DOIs.

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.

Silva Rosas, A. F., Ccala Tola, A. G., & Rivera, R. (2026). Validation of the brief version of the Intrafamily Relations Assessment Scale in young people. *Interacciones, 12*, e515. https://doi.org/10.24016/2026.v12.515

RESPONSE LETTER

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: ------). 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:
Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required
Introduction

1. The introduction is adequate but somewhat lengthy; you could reduce the review of previous Peruvian validations and more clearly emphasize the specific gap addressed by the study and its main objectives/hypotheses.

Thank you for your feedback. In response, the introduction has been revised and restructured, reducing its length to a maximum of four pages. The revised version synthesizes the most relevant previous Peruvian validations. In addition, we added more information about the gap this study has tried to fill. It can be seen in the last three paragraphs of the introduction.
Methods
Participants

2. It would also be useful to place slightly more emphasis on the non-probabilistic sampling strategy and its implications for the generalizability of the findings.

The sampling strategy and its purpose were further clarified at the end of the second paragraph in the participant's section.

Instruments

3. I recommend clarifying why the brief version of the ERI was chosen over other versions, how reverse-coded items were treated.

Thank you for this suggestion. A justification for the selection of the brief version has been incorporated into the final paragraphs of the introduction,
It was specified in the second paragraph of the data analysis section that the items belonging to the Difficulty dimension were reverse-coded solely for the calculation of the item–test correlation, and that in the confirmatory factor analysis and reliability assessment these items were treated in their original form.

Data analysis

4. I recommend clarifying why the MLR estimator was preferred over other options for Likert-type items, also indicating the software used.

In the second paragraph of the data analysis section, it is explained that MLR was employed because simulation studies have demonstrated its superior performance over WLSMV when analyzing measurement invariance (Sass et al., 2014), which constitutes one of the objectives of the study.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required
Instruments

1. In the Instruments section, add a subheading titled Instruments and include an example of one item.

Thank you for this suggestion. A subheading titled "Instruments" has been added to the corresponding section. Additionally, an item example has been included: "My family members usually do activities together."

Results

2. Regarding content validity, it should be presented narratively; therefore, Table 1 should be removed.

Table 1 has been removed.

3. For the descriptive analyses in Table 2, is there evidence of ceiling or floor effects? Please comment on this.
   There was no evidence of ceiling/floor effects and it was commented in the second paragraph of Results section, corresponding to Table 1 interpretation.

4. In Table 3, use the correct notation for alpha and omega coefficients in accordance with APA guidelines.
   Both alpha and omega coefficients were reported in Table 3 according to APA 7 ed. guidelines (Standard font)

5. Table 5 must be presented following APA style.
   Table 5 was formatted according to APA style 7th ed.

6. Since the instrument includes multiple dimensions, the authors should add analyses of HTMT (Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio of Correlations) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).
   Following this recommendation, we calculated the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio to rigorously assess discriminant validity. The resulting HTMT value was .764, which is below the recommended threshold of .85 (Henseler et al., 2015). Regarding convergent validity, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for the Union/Expression factor was .566, exceeding the recommended threshold of .50. For the Difficulties factor, the AVE was .421. Although this value is below .50, it can be considered acceptable given that the factor's construct reliability exceeded the .70 criterion (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). (It can be seen in the final part of the interpretation of Table 2).

Appendix

7. The authors should create a GitHub account where they upload the dataset and the syntax used for the analyses of internal structure validity, invariance, correlations, and reliability. The link must be included at the end of the manuscript.
   The database and the R codes used will be temporarily restricted and available only upon request to the authors, as an additional study with the collected data is still planned.

8. To improve the quality of the manuscript, please consider citing high-impact books and journal articles, including their corresponding DOIs.
   We appreciate this observation.
   We confirm that the revised manuscript includes citations from articles published in journals indexed in internationally recognized databases, such as Scopus and Web of Science.