The Role of Jealousy and Family Coping Strategies in Predicting Sexual Satisfaction in Romantic Relationships

Nayelli. Muñoz[1], Bridget. Abalorio[2*], Klein. Verena[3], Courtney. Hébert[4]

[1] Faculty of Health Sciences, Private University of the North, Lima, Peru
[2] Faculty of Psychology, Peruvian University of Applied Sciences, Lima, Peru
[3] Section of Sexual Psychopathology, Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, and Health Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy
[4] Department of Sexology, Universit´e du Qu´ebec `a Montr´eal, Qu´ebec, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: nayelli.munoz@upn.pe

Editor	Reviewers
Anna Coleman	**Reviewer 1:** Citra Suraya
Senior Research Fellow, Division of Population Health, Health Services Research andPrimary Care, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Oxford Road,Manchester M13 9PL, UK anna.coleman@manchester.ac.uk	rogram Studi Ilmu Keperawatan, STIK Bina Husada Palembang. Email: citra_suraya@yahoo.com
	Reviewer 2: Sarah Croke
	Research Associate, Division of Population Health, Health Services Research andPrimary Care, School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Oxford Road,Manchester M13 9PL, UK. Email: sarah.croke@manchester.ac.uk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction states: "Sexual satisfaction is associated with relationship longevity, emotional well-being, and overall life satisfaction (Wen et al., 2025)." This claim should be further supported by elaborating on the specific mechanisms through which sexual satisfaction influences relationship stability.

The Family Crisis-Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES) is reported to have five subscales, but it is unclear if all subscales were equally relevant to sexual satisfaction. Were any subscales excluded from analysis? Providing a justification for their inclusion or exclusion would be helpful.

The normality assumption is stated to have been tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. However, the reported p-values (e.g., p = 0.092 for sexual satisfaction) suggest near-significance. A brief discussion on whether minor deviations from normality affected statistical analyses would improve the results' robustness.

The article states: "The findings indicate a significant negative correlation between jealousy and sexual satisfaction (r = -0.54, p < 0.01)." However, it does not clarify whether this effect size is considered moderate or strong based on established guidelines. A comparison to Cohen's benchmarks would be useful.

The Discussion section states: "These findings highlight the importance of reducing jealousy and promoting adaptive coping mechanisms in fostering healthy and satisfying romantic relationships." While this conclusion is reasonable, integrating attachment theory (e.g., how jealousy relates to anxious/preoccupied attachment) could further support the argument.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph starting with "While the significance of sexual satisfaction in relationship quality has been widely acknowledged..." introduces the need for further research but does not specify the gaps in previous studies. It would strengthen the rationale if the authors explicitly stated what aspects of jealousy and family coping strategies have been understudied.

The Romantic Jealousy Scale (RJS) is described as measuring three subscales—cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy—but the article does not mention whether these subscales were analyzed separately. Clarifying whether these dimensions were considered independently or as a composite score is important.

The regression model results indicate $R^2 = 0.40$, meaning 40% of the variance in sexual satisfaction is explained by jealousy and coping strategies. However, there is no discussion on whether this is a strong predictive power relative to similar studies. Adding context would improve interpretability.

The reported Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values (1.47 and 1.39) indicate no multicollinearity concerns. However, it would be beneficial to mention the threshold (VIF > 10) explicitly, so readers understand why these values are acceptable.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

2.   Revised

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