

LETTER OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated

Novelty: High

Presentation and writing: Very high

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

Title and Abstract

1. The abstract should be structured into introduction, objective, methods, results, and conclusions.

Introduction

2. The introduction effectively contextualizes the issue of suicidal ideation in adolescents, supported by relevant epidemiological data from the WHO and local sources (INSM HD-HN). However, it is recommended to update the references if possible, as some citations are from 2002 and 2013.

3. Bronfenbrenner's ecological model is mentioned as the theoretical framework. It is suggested to elaborate more clearly on how this model guides the study and the selection of variables, as the variable "intrafamilial relationships" appears to be based on a different theoretical model.

Methods

4. Instruments: It is recommended to specify whether the instrument used to measure intrafamilial relationships has been previously validated in the Peruvian population. If not, was any validity analysis conducted in this study?

5. Procedure: Was approval obtained from an ethics committee? According to editorial policies, a section on Ethical Considerations should be included in the methods section.

6. It is not mentioned whether the assumptions for using PLS-SEM models were evaluated. A detailed explanation is not required, but the authors should confirm which assumptions were assessed and whether they were met.

Results

7. It is unclear whether all participants were included or whether some were excluded based on evaluation or failure to meet inclusion criteria. A flowchart or a description of the number of participants assessed and excluded would be useful. Additionally, if a large number of participants were excluded, it would be valuable to assess potential mechanisms of data loss and whether the data were MCAR, MAR, or MNAR.

8. The tables use acronyms or abbreviations that are not specified in footnotes. Please add footnotes for each table specifying the meaning of terms such as VIF, f^2 , etc. Each table should be interpretable independently.

9. In Table 1, internal consistency is assessed using Cronbach's alpha. While the study does not aim to evaluate the measurement properties of the instruments, tau-equivalence is assumed. Therefore, it is recommended to also report McDonald's omega or conduct a tau-equivalence analysis to justify the use of Cronbach's alpha (as supplementary information).

10. A minor stylistic suggestion to improve readability is to add horizontal lines for each row in Tables 1 and 2, as some collapsed cells make it difficult to read the tables.

Discussion

11. The discussion appropriately contextualizes the findings and addresses implications for suicide prevention. No further comments.

RESPONSE LETTER

To whom it may concern,

In this document, you will find the response to the message about manuscript review.

Reply to comments from reviewer:

1. The format was changed in the abstract, adding the section names as follows: “introduction”, “objective”, “methods”, “results”, and “conclusions”. You’ll find this in the abstract, page 1 and 2, the only paragraph in that section.
2. In the introduction, one more sentence was added to provide a more updated reference about the epidemiology of suicide ideation. The same was done in paragraph four of the same section. Both changes can be found on page 3
3. Two sentences were added about how the theoretical model aligns with the selection of variables. Changes can be found in the introduction section, paragraph 8, page 5.
4. The draft originally stated that the instrument had already been in school students in Lima (this is a city in Peru), which is also the population of the current work, with acceptable Cronbach alpha values. The city the sample was taken from was also mentioned in the respective subsections of the Methods section. Thus, the instrument has already been validated in Peruvian population. In the cited study, no changes were made to the instrument, which is why the proposed handling of the dimensions was conducted in accordance with another cited study (as well as their definitions and purpose of the study) just like the use of the items that corresponded with the short version of the scale. Hence, no changes to the text were made regarding this aspect.
5. The Ethical Consideration section is included in the Ethical Aspects section, which is part of the Methodology in the draft. According to the editorial policies, ethical approval by a committee is not required for studies that use secondary data. This study, as stated in the Ethical Aspects section, used secondary data. The protocol for initial data collection has been stated; however, this can be removed if it avoids confusion and/or improves readability. This issue was also resolved with the editor of the journal when the preliminary version of the manuscript was submitted.
6. The assumptions for the use of PLS-SEM are stated in the Methodology section. The explanation starts in the second paragraph of the Data Analysis subsection. The second paragraph provides a general explanation of SEM techniques. The third paragraph starts with the difference between the choice of PLS-SEM and CB-SEM, explaining why this research utilized PLS-SEM. This paragraph continues with the explanation of the two-stage procedure of PLS-SEM. Later, the subsequent text in this subsection explained the steps in each stage of the PLS-SEM technique, along with the assessment criteria for each output. Further down in the document, in the Results section, after the demographic report, in the subsection named “Assessment of data”, normality parameters of data are evaluated to see if they matched the accepted criteria. However, it is also mentioned that PLS-SEM is a method that is non-parametric. Moreover, the sample size assumptions and calculation are explained in the second paragraph of the “Sample and Data Collection” subsection on page 13.
7. The first paragraph of the “Sample and Data Collection” explains the inclusion and exclusion criteria. In the last paragraph of the “Sample and Data Collection” subsection on page 13, it is explained that 1 respondent was excluded due to incomplete responses and 52 because they did not meet the nationality criterion. The final sample size was still enough for the model, as it was higher than the required minimum sample size estimation for the model. Thus, no significant data was lost.
8. Notes were added to each table in the document to explain acronyms. This was not done for the names of dimensions, indicators, or constructs. This would make the notes too extensive. The names of dimensions, indicators, and constructs are repeated consistently throughout the document to ensure comprehensibility.
9. Cronbach Alpha, rhoC, and rhoA are used as part of the assessment of the measurement model in PLS-SEM. Customarily for a robust assessment rhoC and rhoA are recommended (Hair et al., 2021, Kline, 2023 since they are more precise (Hair et al., 2019), but Cronbach’s Alpha can be included (Hair et al., 2019). In this case, it was included to allow other studies to compare with their findings, as most studies rely on Cronbach’s Alpha. Thinking about this, Cronbach’s Alpha

was left there so that future research could compare the measurement model with their own Cronbach's Alphas. Nevertheless, if it is advisable, Cronbach Alpha can be removed, as it is not part of the analysis, especially if it leads to confusion.

10. Lines were added to table 1 and table 2.
11. No revision was provided.

We look forward to hear back from you and discuss further modifications