

# Understanding the Role of Co-Parenting Quality in Mediating the Effect of Parenting Stress on Child Adjustment

Marco. Conti<sup>1\*</sup>, Giulia. Romano<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Department of Developmental Psychology, University of Rome La Sapienza, Rome, Italy

\* Corresponding author email address: marco.conti@unibo.it

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Fahime Bahonar Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mohammad Masoud Dayarian Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University.Komeinishar/Isfahan,Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, paragraph 2, the phrase “These outcomes are not limited to specific populations...” is overly broad. Consider specifying how generalizable the previous findings are by referring to the representativeness or methodological scope of cited studies.

In paragraph 4 of the Introduction, the sentence “When parents function as a cooperative unit, children benefit from consistent routines...” would benefit from an elaboration on the mechanisms through which emotional security is enhanced in such environments, referencing attachment theory or similar constructs.

In paragraph 6 of the Introduction, the sentence “Such findings support the need to consider co-parenting not only as a mediating variable...” may overstate the conceptual novelty. Consider acknowledging that co-parenting as a mediator has been explored, and clarify what new insight your study adds (e.g., cultural context of Italy, large community-based sample).

In the Measures section for “Co-Parenting Quality,” the claim “higher scores indicating more positive co-parenting interactions” could be nuanced by acknowledging that certain CRS subscales (e.g., exposure to conflict) are reverse-coded, and how that was handled in analysis.

The Data Analysis paragraph ends with “Statistical significance was set at  $p < .05$  for all analyses.” Please specify whether two-tailed or one-tailed tests were used and justify your choice.

In Table 3, the inclusion of GFI and AGFI is helpful, but the Discussion section does not mention them explicitly when asserting model fit. Please briefly interpret these indices in the Discussion to provide a fuller picture.

In Table 4 and the accompanying paragraph, it is stated: “The total effect of parenting stress on child adjustment (including both direct and indirect paths) was significant...” Consider briefly explaining the practical implication of the relative size of direct ( $\beta = .36$ ) versus indirect ( $\beta = -.13$ ) effects in your interpretation.

In the Discussion, the sentence “The present study also corroborates earlier findings by Yacoub et al. (2023)...” could benefit from specifying whether those earlier findings involved clinical or community samples, enhancing the comparison.

In the Discussion, the statement “these findings suggest that relational processes such as co-parenting may serve as key intervention points...” is important. However, it should be accompanied by more concrete examples or evidence from intervention studies.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The final paragraph of the Introduction begins with “The current study is informed by both ecological and family systems perspectives...” — this theoretical grounding is important but could be better integrated into earlier parts of the introduction to justify the model tested.

In the Methods, the sentence “Participants were recruited through online parenting forums, school networks, and community outreach initiatives” lacks detail. Please clarify the selection process (e.g., randomization, regional balance, whether incentives were provided).

In the Measures section under “Child Adjustment,” the phrase “Numerous studies across diverse populations have confirmed the SDQ's reliability...” should be supported by at least one additional recent international validation study to bolster the tool's cross-cultural applicability.

In the Findings and Results, the demographics section mentions the sample had “a diverse range of socioeconomic backgrounds,” yet there is no data or analysis on SES. Please add or clarify how SES diversity was assessed and its implications.

Table 1 is introduced with “suggesting a moderate level of adjustment difficulties.” Consider referencing clinical cutoffs or normative ranges of the SDQ to substantiate this interpretation.

In the assumptions testing paragraph (preceding Table 2), the statement “all of which fell within the acceptable range of -2 to +2” is adequate but would be strengthened by citing a methodological source (e.g., Kim, 2013) or APA standards.

Table 2 shows substantial correlations, but the text does not address potential concerns of common method variance due to all measures being self-report. Consider discussing this limitation and how it was mitigated.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.