



Prioritization of Psychological and Contextual Factors Contributing to Parent–Child Relationship Quality

Angel .Lee¹, Amirul. Iskandar^{2*}

¹ Faculty of Social Sciences & Liberal Arts, Department of Psychology, UCSI University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

² Department of Psychology, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

* Corresponding author email address: amirul@um.edu.my

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Trevor Archer  Professor Department of Psychology University of Gothenburg, Sweden trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Zahra Yousefi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Faranak Saboonchi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: faranaksaboonchi@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction convincingly justifies the study's cultural context, but it could elaborate on why Malaysia provides a unique sociocultural case (e.g., its multiethnic composition and rapid modernization).

While the Friedman test is suitable for ranking, the authors should justify why parametric alternatives (e.g., ANOVA) were not used and discuss assumptions of the test to demonstrate methodological rigor.

The analysis could integrate child developmental stage as a moderating factor—communication expectations differ significantly between young children and adolescents.

The paragraph interprets contextual effects well but could better differentiate between macro-level societal variables (e.g., culture) and micro-level household variables (e.g., marital quality).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This section integrates literature well but should distinguish between trait-level emotional competence and state-level emotional regulation to clarify the conceptual scope.

The paragraph correctly highlights contextual importance but could integrate Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory to strengthen theoretical grounding for contextual determinants.

The discussion of cultural dimensions is strong, but it should explicitly link to Hofstede's cultural dimensions or Triandis' collectivism–individualism framework to anchor its cultural claims in empirical theory.

The aim is clearly stated, but the research questions or hypotheses are not explicitly listed. Adding these would enhance coherence between objectives and subsequent analyses.

The paragraph rightly emphasizes cohesion but should note potential bidirectional effects, where high cohesion might suppress autonomy or conflict expression in collectivist families.

The ranking table is statistically clear, but the standard deviations suggest substantial within-group variation. Discussing these variations by gender or socioeconomic status would enrich interpretation.

The first paragraph effectively summarizes results but could benefit from a short conceptual diagram (e.g., integrated model of prioritized factors) to visualize interrelations between variables.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.