

Reviewer comment- 1

I thoroughly enjoyed reading your manuscript, not least because of the challenging but engaging research methodology. Still, I am bumping into some transparency issues. Below are more questions/suggestions for clarification. Either I expect more transparency in such article about the way and timing of analysis, or I wonder if the critical incident technique is so applicable? Isn't the analysis about much more than the critical incident? There are some very compelling insights in the article when it comes to (dominant) assumptions and counterhegemonies, but because there is little explanation of why what kinds of questions are asked, it is sometimes difficult to follow. In reviewing your manuscript, I had following questions/suggestions: Abstract: From the abstract, it is not immediately clear what kind of data is involved? Interviews? Observations? 1. Introduction - "In responding to this question, Author One presents his critical reflection from a parent's perspective of a persistently conflictual co-parenting relationship and as a student undertaking his Honor's research. Author Two is an educator/supervisor of the Honor's research and an FDR practitioner. Both authors have backgrounds in social work.", this section fits the methodology better because it now distracts from the 'why' we need to investigate this. - At the end of the first paragraph, and the end of the third paragraph, you write the same thing twice. This causes confusion because 1) it is already about how the research happens, instead of the introduction to the theme, and because 2) it is described twice in different wording. - The position of 'critical reflection' is not clear from the introduction. Is it a research method used by the researcher? Or a suggested way in which social workers can guide persistent conflict? Or both? - I recommend you use a clearer structure in the introduction, and remove all repetition. Suggested structure: persistent interparental conflict, engaging with the family court, critical reflection (as research method), research questions/aims - Page 3, line 24: damaging effects for children? Or co-parents? - Unfortunately, many parental relationships never recover from this experience., reference? 2. Methodology - The methodological section creates more clarity. Still, I would devote another specific section here to the difficulties of examining your own data. I would also divide the section into: approach, critical incident, analysis. - In the limitations, you discuss that you will not be able to generalise data. That seems logical to me and therefore not a goal of your methodological approach? So here I would expect a deeper reflection of the research method (see also previous comment). - It also seems to me necessary to highlight your position as a divorced father from the literature (mainly women in research on parenting, but also the position of fathers in co-parenting post-divorce) - Critical incident: I would like to read a bit more when you wrote this? And was this how you felt at the time? Or do you already have the analysis of the moment in your head when you are writing this? I would like to see a bit more transparency in the process of analysis. 3. Results - Page 6, line 1: how did you discover the three themes? How were the destruction questions chosen? Can you give the reader some more transparency? - Page 8, line 19: how do you understand gender? - How does your references shape your analysis and vice versa? Is

this then a deductive or inductive analyzing process? - What cultural/systemic changes do we need to make if children's best interests are to be realized - => Does this question insinuate that the best interests of the child can be conceptualised in a single way? 4. Discussion - Page 11, line 9-10: which are focused on intervention at the level of individual communication difficulties.=> can you explain this a little bit more? - I would start with the last paragraph, because after that you can point out which 'truths' you all had in mind, and how this could be different. 5. Conclusion - Just because the research design is atypical, a concise conclusion would be good to point out the added value of your research. 6. Implications for social work research - men's unique needs and experiences. => how do you frame this statement in literature on gender and parenting?