

Modeling Coparenting Quality Based on Marital Satisfaction, Emotional Intelligence, Parenting Alliance, and Psychological Flexibility

Yanelis. Batista¹, Chloe. Bennett^{2*}, Ricardo. Escobar³


¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Havana, Havana, Cuba

² Department of Counseling Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada



³ Department of Behavioral Psychology, Santa María La Antigua University, Panama City, Panama

* Corresponding author email address: chloe.bennett@uottawa.ca

Editor

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

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Farideh Dokanehi Fard
Associate Professor, Counseling Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Roudehen, Iran. Email: f.dokaneifard@riau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning with “One of the most consistently identified predictors of family functioning is marital satisfaction,” the authors rely heavily on family systems theory; however, the theoretical mechanisms linking marital satisfaction to coparenting quality remain underdeveloped. The manuscript should elaborate on spillover, crossover, and compensation hypotheses and explain which mechanism the proposed model primarily assumes. This addition would strengthen the theoretical foundation of the structural model.

In the paragraph stating that “Parents who possess stronger emotional competencies may be more capable of interpreting their partner’s emotional experiences accurately,” the authors imply a causal process despite employing a cross-sectional design. The wording should be revised to reflect associative rather than causal interpretations, or alternatively, the authors should explicitly acknowledge this limitation within the introduction.

The description of the AAQ-II states that “higher scores indicate greater psychological flexibility.” This is inconsistent with many applications of the AAQ-II, where higher scores generally reflect greater psychological inflexibility unless reverse

scoring is applied. The authors should provide a detailed explanation of scoring procedures and clarify whether reverse coding was conducted before analysis.

In the paragraph stating that “Prior to the main analyses, the internal consistency of each scale was examined using Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability coefficients,” the manuscript fails to report the actual Cronbach’s alpha values. These reliability estimates should be included in a dedicated table, as they are essential for evaluating the psychometric adequacy of the instruments within the current sample.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning “Parenting alliance constitutes another central component of family functioning” raises a significant conceptual concern. Since parenting alliance is theoretically embedded within many definitions of coparenting, the authors should provide evidence of discriminant validity between the Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM) and the Coparenting Relationship Scale (CRS). Without such evidence, the strong path coefficient observed later may partly reflect construct overlap rather than a substantive predictive relationship.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, where the authors state that “relatively few investigations have integrated these variables within a comprehensive model of coparenting quality,” a more systematic review of prior structural models is needed. The authors should identify key studies that simultaneously examined multiple relational and psychological predictors and explicitly demonstrate the unique contribution of the present study relative to those investigations.

In the Methods section, the statement “A multistage convenience sampling strategy was utilized to obtain a diverse sample from urban and suburban regions across Canada” lacks sufficient methodological detail. The authors should describe the stages of recruitment, the provinces represented, the approximate number of participants recruited from each source, and any procedures used to minimize sampling bias.

The eligibility criterion “Individuals experiencing severe psychiatric disorders that could impair their ability to complete self-report questionnaires were excluded from participation” requires clarification. The manuscript does not explain how psychiatric disorders were identified, whether self-report screening was employed, or whether formal diagnoses were verified. This omission raises concerns regarding the operationalization of exclusion criteria.

In the Measures section, the authors report that the CRS consists of “35 items distributed across several dimensions.” However, it is unclear whether coparenting quality was modeled as a higher-order latent construct or whether subscale scores were aggregated. The authors should specify the measurement structure used in the CFA and SEM analyses and justify this choice theoretically and statistically.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.