




Forecasting Internalizing Psychopathology in Adolescents: A Gradient Boosting Approach to Parental Expressed Emotion, Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), and Cognitive Reappraisal

Jean-Claude. Niyonsenga¹, Lena. Hoffmann^{2*}, Carlos. Menjivar³


¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rwanda, Huye, Rwanda

² Department of Cognitive Psychology, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany



³ Department of Psychology, University of El Salvador, San Salvador, El Salvador

* Corresponding author email address: lena.hoffmann@psychologie.uni-heidelberg.de

Editor

Manijeh Daneshpour
Department of Couple and Family
therapy, Alliant International
University, California, United States
of America
mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Abolghasem Khoshkonesh
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences
and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction contextualizes the topic but omits several recent and relevant studies; please ensure you cite and discuss the most recent reviews and primary articles (last 5 years) that bear on your hypotheses. Strengthen the narrative from broad problem → gap → your approach → hypotheses; explicitly state any testable hypotheses or research questions so readers know what the analyses aim to confirm or refute.

Several figures lack clear axis labels, units, and legends; each figure should be interpretable on its own. Improve figure quality (higher resolution), ensure error bars are defined (SE vs SD vs CI), and move long or complex tables to supplementary material while keeping concise summary tables in the main text. Consider adding a flowchart (e.g., CONSORT-like) if the study involves multiple exclusion steps or complex sample selection.

The discussion overstates causal claims in places where the design supports only association; revise language to reflect the strength of inference (e.g., “associated with” rather than “leads to”). Add a dedicated limitations paragraph that candidly treats

sample size, generalizability, measurement error, and potential confounders, and suggest directions for future research or how these limitations could be addressed.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Several methodological details are missing or ambiguous (sampling criteria, inclusion/exclusion, sample size calculation, randomization or blinding procedures where applicable, software and versions used). For reproducibility, provide full details: participant/sample characteristics, recruitment dates, exact experimental/measurement protocols, parameter settings, and any preprocessing steps. If human/animal subjects were used, include IRB/IACUC approval numbers and consent procedures.

The choice of statistical tests should be justified (assumptions checked, e.g., normality, homoscedasticity), and multiple comparisons corrections should be applied when appropriate. Report effect sizes and uncertainty (95% CI) in addition to p-values, and include a short sensitivity analysis or robustness checks (alternative model specifications, outlier handling) to show the results are not fragile.

The results section currently mixes interpretation with findings; keep results focused on objective reporting and reserve interpretation for the discussion. Present key numerical findings in the text (not only in tables/figures), and ensure every table and figure is referenced in the text. Where possible, provide raw or summary numbers (N, means, standard deviations) so readers can judge the magnitude of effects.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.