

The authors deeply appreciate the two reviewers' constructive comments, which have helped improve the quality of our paper. The two independent reviewers' comments were remarkably similar. In this summary, we first list the common concerns raised by both reviewers and how we specifically addressed them, followed by each reviewer's specific concern and our response.

Concern #1: Title alternatives

Response #1: To address the reviewers' concerns about the title, we carefully reviewed each suggested alternative and evaluated how well they aligned with the study's analytic focus. We appreciated that the reviewers consistently used the formulation **without** the article "a," which positions service-oriented identity as a shared cultural construct rather than a singular individualized variant. Based on their guidance, we retained and refined the original title as Intergenerational Transmission of Service-Oriented Identity in Rural First Responder Families, which most accurately and succinctly captures the scope and contribution of the study.

Concern #2: Abstract clarity and methodological transparency

Response #2: The reviewers noted that while the abstract was comprehensive, it lacked an explicit statement of the methodological approach. We revised the abstract to include a clear statement specifying that the study employed a qualitative, inductive thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews. This addition enhances transparency and directly addresses the reviewers' request.

Concern #3: Length and focus of the Introduction

Response #3: The reviewers observed that the introduction was overly long and read largely as a literature review. We substantially streamlined this section, removed redundancies, and integrated key background information more succinctly. The revised introduction foregrounds the study's purpose earlier, tightens narrative flow, and limits extended literature discussion while preserving essential conceptual context. These changes improve clarity and focus, aligning with the reviewers' recommendations.

Concern #4: Theoretical Framework clarity and redundancy

Response #4: The reviewers noted that the theoretical framework, while strong, was not clearly distinguished from the introduction and contained some repetitive elements. We addressed this by adding a clear header, "Theoretical Framework," and labeling subsections to improve organization: Social Learning, Family Systems, and Cultural Norms. Repetitive language and overlapping content were streamlined while retaining depth, citations, and logical flow. These revisions enhance clarity, readability, and structural transparency.

Concern #5: Data Analysis detail

Response #5: The reviewers observed that while thematic coding was described, the process of theme generation and software use were not specified. We clarified that themes were generated using an inductive, iterative approach through repeated readings and discussion among coders. We also noted that no qualitative data analysis software was used and that coding was conducted manually to maintain close engagement with the data. These revisions provide greater transparency regarding the analytic process and methodological rigor.

Concern #6: Reference formatting consistency

Response #6: We carefully reviewed the manuscript to ensure (1) correct reference formatting, and (2) consistency between in-text citations and the reference list, confirming that all cited references appear in the reference list.

Reviewer A Specific Concern: The IRB statement appeared twice, in both the Introduction and Methods sections.

Response: The IRB statement was removed from the Introduction section.

Reviewer B Specific Concern: Use a consistent term for the core concept.

Response: We standardized the terminology throughout the manuscript, using service-oriented identity consistently.