

Prioritizing Predictors of Family Cohesion in Dual-Earner Households

Lukas. Brandner¹ , Álvaro. Montoya^{2*} , Miguel. Figueiredo³ 

¹ Department of Health Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

² Department of Social Psychology, Autonomous University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

³ Department of Behavioral Psychology, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

* Corresponding author email address: alvaro.montoya@uam.es

Editor

Habib Hadianfar¹ 

Affiliation: Professor, Department of Psychology, Shiraz University, Iran
hadianfd@shirazu.ac.ir

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:

The discussion of “role conflict... defined as the tension arising when expectations from work and family domains are mutually incompatible” needs to reference a current source beyond Pines et al. (2011). Integrate a recent 2024 or 2025 reference to demonstrate contemporary relevance post-pandemic.

The sentence “The first phase aimed to identify and conceptualize key predictors...” could specify inclusion and exclusion criteria more explicitly. Mention whether only peer-reviewed English studies were used and the time range (e.g., 2010–2025).

The sample description is clear, but justification for choosing Spain as the research site is missing. Include a rationale—such as sociocultural comparability, labor policies, or family structure diversity—to contextualize the selection.

The authors state, “Data were collected exclusively through a systematic literature review.” However, PRISMA or similar systematic review protocols are not mentioned. Add a flow diagram reference or indicate adherence to a review guideline.

The authors write, “A structured questionnaire was developed based on the themes identified...” but do not mention validity procedures (e.g., expert panel review, pilot testing). Clarify how content validity was established prior to administration.

The section reports “Kendall’s coefficient of concordance (W)...” but omits the significance level or degrees of freedom. Provide statistical details to enhance transparency (e.g., $W = 0.81$, $p < .001$, $df = k - 1$).

The table is comprehensive, but the Concepts (Open Codes) column is dense. Consider summarizing codes into more abstract terms or providing a figure illustrating relationships among themes (e.g., a thematic map).

The section describing “work–family balance” reads narratively rather than analytically. Use comparative phrasing (e.g., “Consistent with prior findings, flexible work arrangements predicted greater harmony...”) to emphasize interpretive synthesis.

The concluding sentence “These findings support and extend prior research suggesting that...” is strong but should be followed by a statement of practical implications (e.g., “Family therapists and policymakers can apply these findings to design targeted interventions.”)

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning “At the interpersonal level, communication and trust serve as pivotal mechanisms...” is strong, but it merges empirical and conceptual material. Consider splitting it into two paragraphs: one conceptualizing communication, the other reviewing empirical findings, for clarity.

In the paragraph starting “Furthermore, research indicates that proactive coping and adaptive emotional regulation...”, the authors list emotional competencies but do not indicate how these were operationalized or measured in prior studies. Adding a short methodological note would strengthen scholarly depth.

The sentence “The present study aims to prioritize and rank the key predictors...” appropriately ends the introduction, but the transition could be improved by summarizing the literature gap. Add a one-sentence statement such as “However, few studies have empirically ranked these predictors through integrative mixed-method designs.”

The table lists “Priority Level,” which is a qualitative descriptor. Provide a short methodological note explaining how cutoffs between “Very High,” “High,” and “Moderate” were determined (e.g., by percentile thresholds).

The authors report “Communication patterns followed closely...” but do not include statistical variance or confidence intervals. Consider adding these to strengthen inferential credibility.

The sentence “Emotional and marital quality ranked third in importance...” integrates interpretation with external citations effectively, but could be expanded by linking to family systems or ecological models (e.g., Bronfenbrenner) to anchor theoretical implications.

The statement “Taken together, the results support a multidimensional model of family cohesion...” would benefit from an illustrative figure summarizing this model (e.g., concentric layers showing individual, relational, and structural predictors).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. **Revised**

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.