

Mexico City, June 4, 2025

Interacciones Journal  
Peruvian Institute of Psychological Orientation  
[revistainteracciones@gmail.com](mailto:revistainteracciones@gmail.com)

Dear Editorial Committee of Interacciones:

We extend our warmest greetings and deeply appreciate the thorough review and valuable comments provided regarding our manuscript "Assessment of Psychological Competencies in the Clinical Field for University Students" (ID-446). The meticulousness and professionalism of your team have been instrumental in enhancing this work.

In response to the "Revision Required" decision, we are submitting:

1. The revised manuscript version with tracked changes
2. A detailed table specifying how we addressed each comment from Reviewers A, B, and C
3. The strobe check list

Section	Reviewer	Reviewer Feedback	Author's response	Modification Location
Título	A	Explicitly state the exploratory nature of the study in the title so that readers immediately understand its scope and design.	The title was modified to include the type of study (exploratory analysis) and the theoretical framework underpinning the evaluation (interbehavioral perspective).	Title, page 1.

Título	C	The title ("Assessment of Psychological Competencies in the Clinical Field for University Students") is informative but overly general. It is recommended to specify the type of competencies (e.g., "interbehavioral") and the evaluation system used (EVACOMPS). Suggested example: "Evaluation of Interbehavioral Clinical Competencies in Psychology Students Using EVACOMPS: A Cross-sectional Study."	Reference to EVACOMPS was omitted, as its limited recognition might confuse readers regarding the meaning of the acronym and divert attention from the central focus of the paper.	
Resumen	C	The abstract should be structured into background, objective, method, results, and conclusions. It is recommended to present the study's main conclusion in a more concise manner.	It was revised to make the abstract more concise, and to ensure it is structured according to the mentioned sections. The conclusion was synthesized.	Abstract y resumen (pages 1 y 2)
Introducción	A	Condense the historical background		Training Psychologists at FEZ
Introducción	B	In the introduction (paragraphs 1 to 4) the information presented could be summarize	The first paragraphs were revised to synthesize dispensable historical aspects.	Zaragoza: Progress and Challenges page 3, paragraphs 1 y 2.
Introducción	A	A comment has been made regarding Ibáñez's definition of competence. Please add current citations to strengthen your argument.	Ibáñez's (2024) position was made explicit, and it was argued that despite their differences, both emphasize the connection with specific domains through the evaluation of criteria established by experts.	Training Psychologists at FEZ Zaragoza: Progress and Challenges. Page 3, paragraph 8.
Introducción	A	Include a review of other virtual systems for assessing competencies in clinical psychology to position your contribution	Brief analyses of four studies were added that incorporate virtual systems for assessing psychological competencies in clinical settings, along with	Assessment of Psychologists' Professional Competencies: page 4,

Introducción	C	The knowledge gap addressed by the study should be more clearly identified (e.g., the lack of performance-based evaluations in psychology programs in Mexico).	their limitations (focusing on specific aspects of performance).	paragraphs 1, 2 y 3
Introducción	C	The introduction provides a solid institutional and theoretical context, but the relevance of the interbehavioral approach in assessing professional readiness should be more clearly integrated. For example, it is recommended to justify why interbehavioral performance assessment is superior to traditional approaches.	A paragraph was added that explicitly highlights the relevance of the behavioral approach in the assessment and advancement of higher education students.	Assessment of Psychologists' Professional Competencies. Page 4, paragraph 4.
Introducción	C	An explicit statement of the study's objective should be included in a separate paragraph prior to the methods section	The study objective was included in a dedicated paragraph.	Evaluation of the Psychologist's Competencies Developed at FES Zaragoza: An Approach Page 8, paragraph 5.
Método	A	Specify the number of expert judges and the criteria used for their selection, report Osterlind indices per item with 95 % confidence intervals, and include ordinal alpha for each competency type.	The number of judges, inclusion and exclusion criteria, Osterlind indices was added. The ordinal alpha was calculated, but the implementation of this analysis revealed violations of key statistical assumptions, particularly the presence of negative average inter-item covariance, which compromises the model's requirements.. In order to enhance the robustness of the analysis, content validity indices (CVI; Pedrosa et al., 2014) were calculated for the supplementary exercises. The obtained values ranged from 0.75 to 0.87, demonstrating moderate to high content validity.	Assessment of Psychologists' Professional Competencies. Page 7, paragraph 2  And  Method, page 8, paragraph 1.

Método	A	Provide a rationale for using the platform equivalently on both laptops and smartphones.	The rationale for the equivalent use of computers and laptops in the evaluation was explained.	Method, page 8, paragraph 2.
Método	B	In the method, please give more information about the sample, how you determined the sample size.		
Método	C	Participants: The number of students per group is provided (n = 16 and n = 24), but there is no information regarding inclusion/exclusion criteria, recruitment procedures, or basic sociodemographic characteristics. This information is necessary to assess external validity. It is also unclear how the sample size was determined or whether it is representative of the target population.	Arguments were added regarding participant determination.	Method, page 8, paragraph 1.
Método	B	Also, describe the procedures used to reduce the risk of confounding variable during the procedure	Procedures were described to prevent the impact of confounding variables.	Procedure. Page 11, paragraph 3.
Método	C	The method section should be reorganized and rewritten. The study design is not clearly stated until the end of the section, which should be made explicit from the beginning. It is recommended to use the following subheadings: Design, Setting, Participants, Instruments, Procedure, Analysis Plan, Ethical Aspects.	The method section was rewritten to clarify the relevant aspects of the study.	Method, pages 8-11
Método	C	Design: While it can be inferred that this is a cross-sectional study, this should be explicitly stated	It is explicitly stated that the study follows a cross-sectional design.	Procedure. Page 9, tabla 3.

Método	C	Setting: The context in which the data were collected is not described. It is recommended to include this section to help readers understand the conditions of the study and facilitate replication.	Information about the evaluation context was included.	Procedure, page 9, paragraph 1.
Método	C	It is suggested that authors adhere to the STROBE checklist for cross-sectional studies and include it as supplementary material.	The checklist was agreed in the annex section	
Método	C	Biases: The study does not address how selection bias or survivorship bias (e.g., participation only from those with stronger skills) was controlled. This should be clarified	Measures to control selection and/or survivorship bias were explicitly stated.	Procedure, page 12, paragraph 1.
Método	C	Instruments: A modified version of EVACOMPS is mentioned, but no detail is provided on what modifications were made, how new activities were validated, or their psychometric properties. It is also suggested to include at least one task example per competency to illustrate their operationalization	All recommendations were incorporated, except for illustrative examples. Due to the multimedia nature of these materials—which would require extensive description—and given that they were previously analyzed in detail in an earlier publication (Reference X), that source was cited to avoid redundancy.	Assessment of Psychologists' Professional Competencies. Page 7, paragraph 2  And Method, page 8, paragraph 1.
Resultados	A	Report effect-size estimates to convey the magnitude of the differences between semesters	An independent samples Student's t-test was performed, and the effect size was reported.	results, page 12, paragraph 2.
Resultados	B	Further analyze the data obtained (more comments on the attached archive below)	The description of the results was rewritten to provide greater detail.	Results, pages 12-16
Resultados	C	Tables 5 and 6 could be integrated into the main text or removed altogether.	Tables 5 and 6 do not exist; the descriptions of Figures 5 and 6 have been incorporated into the text.	x
Resultados	C	Furthermore, the absence of hypothesis testing is concerning. It is recommended that the authors evaluate whether the	An independent samples Student's t-test was performed, and the effect size was reported.	Results, page 12, paragraph 2.

		sample size insufficient to conduct hypothesis tests (e.g., Student's t-test or ANOVA), as descriptive analysis alone offers limited robustness. Additionally, effect sizes should be reported to assess the magnitude of the observed differences.		
Resultados	C	Reportar tamaños del efecto para valorar magnitud de las diferencias observadas.		
Redacción general	C	It is recommended that the authors seek assistance from a professional editor to improve the overall clarity and readability of the manuscript.	Unfortunately, time did not permit seeking an editor to review the text; however, we used AI to improve its clarity.	x
Discusión	A	Explain the similarity of your findings with previous EVACOMPS studies, and incorporate evidence from research external to that line	Its connection with other studies was added.	Discussion, page 16, paragraph 1.
Discusión	A	temper claims regarding predictive capacity until validity evidence is available.	The statement was qualified to provide a more nuanced interpretation.	Discussion, page 18, paragraph 3.
Discusión	A	Consider further condensing the discussion, and temper claims regarding predictive capacity until validity evidence is available	Sections of the discussion were removed.	Discussion
Discusión	C	The discussion is consistent with the interbehavioral framework but requires better organization. It is suggested to divide the section into: Summary of Findings, Interpretation, Educational Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions.	The discussion was reorganized under these terms.	Discussion, page 16-19

Discusión	C	A more in-depth discussion of the potential causes of poor performance is needed, particularly regarding the "Identification of Relevant Cases" competency (e.g., curricular shortcomings, lack of real clinical practice).	Possible explanations for these results were added.	Discussion, página 17, párrafo 3.
Discusión	C	Educational implications are insufficiently discussed. It would be valuable to propose specific actions for curricular redesign or pedagogical improvement.	Two paragraphs were added describing the potential educational implications derived from the research.	Discussion, page 19, paragraphs 2 y 3
Discusión	C	The study's limitations are not mentioned. It is recommended to discuss the small sample size, lack of institutional representativeness, and reliance on simulated rather than real clinical settings.	Two paragraphs were added outlining the limitations of the research.	Discussion, page 19, paragraphs 4 y 5
Conclusión	C	The conclusion should be more specific and avoid generalities. Suggested phrasing: "Performance-based assessment revealed insufficient acquisition of key clinical competencies among psychology students, highlighting the need to strengthen the curriculum in case formulation and diagnostic reasoning."	The conclusion was revised to make it more direct.	Discussion page 19, paragraph 6
Referencias	A	Verify that all in-text citations appear in the reference list, correct any year discrepancies, italicize thesis titles, and omit the publisher's location in accordance with APA 7.	It was verified that the citations were included in the reference list, and typographical errors were corrected.	References, page 20

It should be noted that the aforementioned table consolidates the comments provided in the received correspondence; however, when additional observations were identified within the document, these were likewise addressed appropriately.

We have incorporated all suggestions with academic rigor, prioritizing clarity, precision, and study relevance. Each recommendation has been received with gratitude and reflects our commitment to enhancing research quality.

Should the manuscript be accepted, we authorize the inclusion of reviewers' names (for those who have so indicated) in the publication.

I remain available for any additional comments and reiterate my appreciation for the opportunity to improve this work through your valuable editorial process.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Zavala Peralta

Faculty of Higher Studies Iztacala

National Autonomous University of Mexico

[zavala@iztacala.unam.mx](mailto:zavala@iztacala.unam.mx)