

Article history: Received 23 July 2024 Revised 05 September 2024 Accepted 15 September 2024 Published online 10 October 2024

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Design and Validation of a Parent-Adolescent Educational Package Based on Their Lived Experiences

Mina. Atashsokhan¹, Khadijeh. Abolmaali Alhosseini^{2*}, Nasrin. Bagheri³

Doctoral Student of Educational Psychology, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran
Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: kh.abolmaali@tnb-iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction effectively contextualizes the significance of adolescence but lacks a clear connection between the literature and the specific aim of this study. Consider explicitly stating how the reviewed literature justifies the need for developing the parent-adolescent educational package.

The article mentions the use of semi-structured interviews, but the development and testing of the interview guide are not discussed in depth. It would be beneficial to include information on how the interview questions were developed and refined.

The description of the coding process is concise but could be enhanced by including an example of how raw data were transformed into codes and categories. This would clarify the rigor of the qualitative analysis.

The categorization of concepts in Table 1 is comprehensive. However, it would be helpful to discuss why some concepts, such as "Resistance to accepting religious beliefs," were grouped together and the implications of these groupings.

The use of the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) and Content Validity Index (CVI) to validate the package is appropriate. However, the process by which the expert panel was selected and their qualifications should be detailed to reinforce the credibility of the validation process.

The overall CVR and CVI values are reported, but the paper does not discuss any potential discrepancies among expert opinions or how these were resolved. Providing such insights would enhance transparency.

While the discussion effectively relates the findings to existing literature, it could benefit from a more critical analysis. For instance, explore potential reasons why certain findings align or diverge from previous studies, particularly in the context of cultural differences.

The conclusion mentions that the educational package could be adapted for other regions, but this statement lacks specificity. Consider providing more concrete suggestions or examples of how the package could be tailored to different populations.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence "Findings also support a general decline in psychological well-being, especially among adolescent girls" could benefit from a more recent citation to support this claim. Consider referencing studies published within the last five years.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are well-defined; however, the rationale behind selecting only mothers and adolescent girls should be more clearly articulated. How might this gender-specific focus affect the generalizability of the findings?

The process of achieving theoretical saturation with 27 participants is mentioned but not sufficiently detailed. It would strengthen the study to provide a more explicit description of how saturation was determined and why this sample size was considered adequate.

The practical applications of the educational package are mentioned briefly. Expanding on how this package could be adapted for use in different cultural or educational contexts would increase the paper's relevance to a broader audience.

The limitation regarding the gender and geographical specificity of the sample is acknowledged. However, the potential impact of these limitations on the findings should be discussed in more detail, particularly regarding the generalizability of the educational package.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

