

## BUKTI KORESPONDENSI ARTIKEL JURNAL INTERNASIONAL BEREPUTASI

**Judul artikel:** A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

**Jurnal:** Humanities and Social Sciences Communications; Vol. 11, 937, p. 1-15; doi: 10.1057/s41599-024-03440-4

No	Perihal	Tanggal
1	Submission received	04-09-2023
2	Decision on manuscript (1 <sup>st</sup> round review)	24-10-2023
3	Manuscript resubmitted (for 1 <sup>st</sup> round review)	29-11-2023
4	Decision on manuscript (2 <sup>nd</sup> round review)	12-02-2024
5	Manuscript resubmitted (for 2 <sup>nd</sup> round review)	12-04-2024
6	Decision on manuscript (3 <sup>rd</sup> round review)	25-06-2024
7	Manuscript resubmitted (for 3 <sup>rd</sup> round review)	3-7-2024
8	Acceptance	8-7-2024
9	Paper has been published	19-7-2024



---

## HSSCOMMS-16034-T Associate Editor Assigned

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Mon 9/4/2023 10:08 AM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

You don't often get email from hsscomms@springernature.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Dr Setiawan,

On 4th Sep 23, we received your manuscript entitled "A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience" by authors [author information removed for double blind peer review].

Your manuscript has been assigned the following ID #: HSSCOMMS-16034-T.

The editorial team will be in touch with a decision once your manuscript has been assessed. Owing to the volume of submissions we receive we cannot guarantee a time frame in which this decision will be communicated to you.

Delays can sometimes arise due to the lack of availability of external editors and referees. However, please be assured you that we work to process all submissions as speedily and efficiently as possible.

In the interim, you may check on the status of this manuscript by selecting the "Check Manuscript Status" link under the following URL:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A4Cd4GqO1A4azQ5F2A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A4Cd4GqO1A4azQ5F2A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ)

(Press/Click on the above link to be automatically sent to the web page).

Thank you for submitting your work to Humanities and Social Sciences Communications.

Sincerely,

The Editorial Office  
Humanities & Social Sciences Communications

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here  
<http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



---

## HSSCOMMS-16034-T: Major Revision

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Tue 10/24/2023 6:10 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

 1 attachment (49 KB)

1\_reviewer\_attachment\_1\_1697861890\_convrt.pdf;

You don't often get email from hsscomms@springernature.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034-T

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

Thank you for submitting the above paper to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

We have now completed peer review on your paper – this was overseen by a handling Editor.

The Editor has requested 'major revisions', the full details of which are outlined at the bottom of this letter.

We invite you to evaluate the comments carefully and if you feel you can address the issues identified, we would welcome a revision. A revision would be sent out again for review, but I cannot guarantee it will be accepted for publication.

A judgement on suitability for publication would be based on whether the Editor and reviewers conclude their initial comments have been addressed satisfactorily, and to what degree they feel your paper meets the journal's [criteria for acceptance](#).

We have set a suggested resubmission deadline for your paper of **28th Nov 23**.

Please ensure that your revision is FULLY aligned with the journal's guidelines, which are outlined in the checklist at the foot of this message. If your files are not correctly formatted, we will return them to you for modification. This will inevitably delay the processing of your submission.

Please click on the link below to submit the revision online:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A2Cd5GgO4A7azQ7I6A9ftdF7U2fgTB3Zkn65lcd84QZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A2Cd5GgO4A7azQ7I6A9ftdF7U2fgTB3Zkn65lcd84QZ)

Lastly, this is a reminder that this publication is an open-access journal that uses an article processing charge (APC) model payable on acceptance for publication. Full details on that policy can be found [here](#).

Thank you for submitting this paper to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

Yours sincerely,

Gino D'Oca

Chief Editor  
Humanities and Social Sciences Communications

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

---

---

## PEER REVIEW COMMENTS

Please note that editor and referee feedback is reproduced below verbatim as it was received by the editorial office. The feedback represents the perspectives of the anonymous handling editor and referees, unless otherwise stated.

Associate Editor (Remarks to Author (required)):

This paper examines the relationship between relational wellbeing and resilience in slum communities in Indonesia. The key arguments presented in the paper are that relational wellbeing contributes to individual resilience in these communities, and that family and community support mediate this relationship. While the paper makes a noteworthy attempt to explore this relationship, there are significant concerns about its clarity, validity, methodology, and the framing of the theoretical constructs.

### Validity:

The research question, which explores the connection between relational wellbeing and resilience in slum communities, is valid and relevant. However, like the reviewers, I feel that the paper lacks a clear focus on whether you are addressing resilience in daily life, during crises, or both, this would need defining. Furthermore, there are concerns about the logical coherence of the theoretical framework, the integration of multiple frameworks, and the conflation of wellbeing and resilience. These issues need to be addressed to enhance the paper's validity.

### Data and Methodology:

While the data and methodology used in the study are briefly outlined, I, like reviewer 2, suggest that there is a need for more comprehensive descriptions of the data collection process and specific measurement items for the constructs under investigation. Including clarity around sample sizes (600 or 700?), providing more information about the context of the three Indonesian cities, and clearly identifying how each construct is measured and defined is essential to help readers understand the findings, and indeed for any replicability.

#### Analytical Approach:

The paper's analytical approach needs strengthening. Reviewers have raised concerns about causation between wellbeing and resilience and the lack of evidence to establish a causal relationship. Additionally, the paper could benefit from a more coherent theoretical framework, potentially focusing on community resilience, given the context of slum communities, or else clear justification as to why individual, rather than community, resilience is more pertinent here. The definitions of various dimensions of wellbeing should be consistent, more clearly defined and operationalised.

#### Contribution:

The paper needs to establish more clearly how it contributes to the existing literature. While there is potential for the paper to make a meaningful contribution, this is currently hindered by issues of clarity and the need to engage more deeply with relevant literature. It should aim to provide a specific and unique perspective that clearly demonstrates how this paper achieves the proposed goals - for example, you state that the paper will "offer practical implications for policymakers" and "identify pathways for contributing to resilience ...to develop interventions and policies", however, it is not clear to me where this is done. Making this explicit will clearly demonstrate the papers contribution.

#### Suggested Improvements:

**Clarify Research Focus:** Specify whether the paper primarily focuses on resilience in daily life, crisis situations, or both and ensure the paper is framed according to this throughout.

#### Theoretical Framework:

Address the issues concerning the integration of multiple theoretical frameworks and consider adopting a more coherent framework, such as community resilience.

#### Causation:

Clarify the paper's goals, whether it seeks to establish causation or correlations between wellbeing and resilience.

#### Context:

Provide detailed context about the three Indonesian cities, highlighting their similarities and differences.

#### Dimensions of Wellbeing:

Offer clear, operational definitions and examples for dimensions of wellbeing.

#### Wellbeing and Resilience:

Revise the text to avoid implying that wellbeing is a tool to develop positive family relationships.

#### Literature Review:

Enhance the literature review to better justify the chosen framework and engage more deeply with existing literature.

#### Measurement and Items:

Include specific measurement items and a more comprehensive description of the data collection process.

#### Contribution:

Explicitly discuss how your findings can contribute to policy development and interventions.

### Clarity and Context:

By addressing these issues, you will undoubtedly improve the clarity and context of the paper to make it more accessible to readers.

In conclusion, the paper has potential, but there are several key issues that need to be addressed. The reviewers and I recommend a major revision to enhance the clarity, theoretical framework, methodology, and overall quality of the paper. Addressing these concerns will significantly improve the paper's potential for publication.

### Reviewer #1 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

The results of the study can extend our understanding of the association between relational wellbeing and resilience. However, the manuscript does not clearly distinguish between resilience in the context of daily basis hardship confronted by slum dwellers and resilience in the context of disruptions caused by crises and disasters. The authors need to make some amendments, so the readers can clearly grasp that the "dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience" is in the context of adaptability to sustained daily hardship.

### Reviewer #2 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

This paper uses three case studies from slum dwellers in three Indonesian cities to explore the relation between well-being and resilience, and in particular the more relational elements or dimensions of well-being, such as family and community relations, that contribute to individual resilience. Whereas the paper is commendable in terms of the large sample and the its quantitative analysis, it ultimately falls short of its goal as it fails to provide worthwhile insights to understand the specifics of how higher levels of well-being increase resilience (if at all). Some sort of correlation between the two is shown at the end, but this appears insufficient in the light of what was announced in the article's abstract.

There are several major shortcomings in the manuscript that make it unacceptable as is, although it might be worth reconsidering if extensively revised and re-written:

First, the concept of well-being (WB) is poorly defined, and this leads to the misconception that WB is a "tool" to bring about resilience (see below). Higher levels of WB are certainly found among people with higher levels of resilience, but WB is not, per se, a tool. There is also a problem of commensurability between the two elements that the study is trying to bring together, well-being and resilience. The former is framed in terms of its more relational aspects, whereas resilience instead is framed following Benard's notion of individual resilience. Given the choice of the authors to follow White's (and to a lesser extent McCubbin's) otherwise well-tested and valid conceptual framework for relational well-being, as well as their focus on family and – especially – on community, it would appear that a more logical choice would have been to look at community resilience, rather than individual resilience. Individual resilience focuses on personal and intrapersonal traits such as emotions, optimism, hope etc. whereas community resilience focuses more on the community, social connectedness and networks and the community's capacity to solve problems.

This lack of commensurability is amplified by a lack of integration between the models. Having

three different theoretical frameworks (White, McCubbin and Benard's) makes integrating them all a difficult task, and the paper lacks a strong sense of coherence due to this lack of integration of its different framings. In addition to this, there is no proper critical assessment of each one of the proposed frameworks: what are their shortcomings? What is left out (for example, does the proposed model of relational WB account for intra-group differences?)

The second shortcoming of the paper is that the design of the study does not allow to establish causation between well-being and resilience. While the correlation between those two can be gleaned from the results (as well as anticipated from the literature), there is no evidence that one is the cause for the other. The study does not enunciate the dependent and independent variables clearly enough to either prove or disprove its three hypotheses.

The third problem is the lack of a consistent literature review to support the choices made in terms of the article's approach. The paper cites some of the relevant literature on WB and resilience but it does not engage with it in a systematic way. For example, important theories or framings of well-being are left out, such as the common differentiation between subjective well-being (SWB) and eudaimonic or objective well-being (EWB). There are many parts of the paper in which the different framings of WB read more like list of different dimensions of WB, rather than a systematic review (see below for more details).

The paper often progresses by building up an argument through a concept that remains undefined, then conflating that concept with another one (for example, community and social capital, or WB and mental health are treated as one and the same). There is more of a juxtaposition between different concepts of WB than a critical engagement and comparison. This is notable in the use of White's framework, which is delineated in a first iteration, then gets expanded upon through a second iteration, for the authors to finally return to the first iteration and juxtapose it with McCubbin's model. This results in a very confusing theoretical framework, and one to which the results of the study are very hard to relate to.

Re-writing the paper using a different theoretical framework (one that uses the concept of community resilience instead, see for example Shea 2018) might work, but there are also other shortcomings in the paper (theoretical and structural) that make it problematic (see below).

Specific comments:

p. 2, last paragraph: WB and resilience are indeed associated to positive emotions but the way this is written it seems to reduce WB and resilience to emotions only, leaving no role for cognitive elements. The addition of sustainability, somehow parachuted at the end of the paragraph, is unwarranted as it hasn't been arrived at through a logical argument.

p. 3 first paragraph: "Resilience and wellbeing range in scope from personal or psychological wellbeing..." this sentence pertains to WB, not to resilience. There is a tendency throughout the paper to conflate these two for the sake of driving forward the argument.

p. 3 second paragraph: "With relationality central to individuals' evaluation of their current situations, the expression of their relational wellbeing will emerge from their perceived relationships with their family and their community." This is too simplistic an assumption: their relational WB can emerge from other instances of relationality: relations to the place, to the environment (built and non-built), relations with others that are not family and community... Also, note that personal and psychological WB are not necessarily the same.

Theoretical framework:

The definition given for resilience ("Individual resilience describes how individuals bounce back from negative life events and become more resilient") doesn't explain much – it's a circular or self-referential definition, where resilience means "becoming more resilient." There is a wealth of literature on resilience, its origins in the field of ecology and how it has subsequently been adopted and used in the social sciences, especially in the context of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. There is also a strand of resilience thinking that originates in the psychological sciences (allegedly the one used by the authors). This concept is central to the paper and as such it needs to be systematically dealt with, if possible through a succinct literature review that goes beyond the choice of Banard's definition.

The protective factors that contribute to individual resilience delineated on p. 5 after Banard need to be more fleshed out in order to be considered both relevant and operational in the empirical study. For example, what is meant by high expectations message? The role of group and individual values in defining those expectations is left out, as is the role of place and other defining characteristics of the environment (here reduced to family and community).

The concept of community is also fully taken for granted throughout the paper. There is no attempt at defining what is – and what is not – a community, leading to the assumption that it is a homogenous, bounded and universally accepted entity that can be recognized by anybody. Community remains obscure throughout the paper, especially given how little context is given of the three places in which the case studies took place. There is abundant literature that provides a critical assessment of the concept of community that needs to be dealt with here, as the article pivots heavily on family and community.

Something similar can be said about family, rather simplistically depicted as a homogeneous, univocal source of positive factors and emotions. Nothing is said about the family also being a potential source of obligations or conflict (e.g. gender-based violence). Clearly both family and community can be sources of individual resilience, but they can also undermine it, and the way both concepts are engaged with in this theoretical framework seems to ignore that.

p. 7: This is a good use of White's framework. I suggest the authors rely more on it to build up their case, maybe by bringing it up earlier in the paper and centering the discussion around it, then adding the discussion on environmental relations in p. 8. As it is now, that discussion reads too disconnected. Having a systematic review on different conceptualizations of WB would help the authors explain why the chosen model is better or more appropriate than other models, what does it do that other conceptualizations of WB, relational or non-relational, don't do.

p. 7: How is subjective well-being and psychological WB different? Most of the literature would argue it's the same thing.

p. 8, last two paragraphs: the environmental aspects of WB are left out, which seems odd given that the concept of resilience has its origins in ecology and the ecological dimensions are key in its theorization.

p. 9: the choices for the definition of relational WB don't seem fully justified. For ex. why is the participation in family and community considered but not participation in society at large (e.g. relations with the state, institutions – formal and informal)? Other dimensions need further explanation before they can be considered (not doing so adds confusion to the paper rather than clarity): what is meant by security? Is it personal safety (and if so, how is this relational?). Financial security? Competition for what? Prestige, social status, resources, positions of power? Does access to facilities cover services as well? What is meant by "self-concept," and how does that tie in with relational WB? Furthermore, these are not quite the same dimensions as the ones mentioned

earlier in the paper, which adds to the lack of consistency throughout the manuscript (e.g. is subjective material WB the same as material satisfaction?). I suggest addressing these dimensions in a more systematic manner, one that is integrated within the frameworks reviewed above that puts groups dimensions of WB under different categories (for example social and human, since the authors are following White's framework) and explaining what is covered by each category with an example (even using a table if possible).

p. 9: "Specifically, we expect that individuals living in slum areas who have material assets, social connections and the capacity to act collectively with others, are more likely to have higher resilience". If this is the central hypothesis of the article I would expect to see it before p. 9 (it should be mentioned right after the research question).

#### Methods:

There is no information whatsoever on the context of the three cities. Why were they chosen, other than because they face risks of water-related disasters according to a World Bank report? How are they similar/different? What are the distinctive elements that make them/their inhabitants vulnerable? This lack of background and context makes it very difficult to put the findings of the paper in perspective, and to extrapolate them to other situations/contexts, which severely limits the scope for this article to be impactful.

p. 12: If  $n = 300$  in each city ( $\times 3$  cities), why is the total  $n = 700$ ?

p. 14: "Initially we started with 16 items distributed equally in four dimensions." What are these 16 items? Can you provide a description of them and the four dimensions?

#### Discussion and conclusion:

p. 21 second paragraph: I am not sure well-being, relational or not, can be considered as a "means" to something (in this case for individuals to develop positive family relationships – it's probably the other way around). WB is more of a measurable outcome of the way people see themselves in life or state of being that is usually self-assessed (or assessed externally based on a series of previously-agreed upon elements). I would say that positive family relationships can result in (or are an index of) enhanced well-being and enhanced well-being correlates positively with enhanced resilience. The point is that well-being is a state of being in itself, not so much an instrument used to reach a state, as this phrasing implies (i.e. that well-being is a tool to 'develop positive family relationships.'). This might be a problem of phrasing, but in any case it remains very unclear. Relational well-being surely can increase resilience, but the study, as is presented here, does not prove that particular causation (how do we know, for example, that it's the more resilient people, to begin with, who are in a position to dedicate more time to family relations and as such show higher levels of well-being?).

p. 22 last paragraph: here there is a conflation between mental health and WB; they are not the same.

#### Reference:

Shea, J. 2018. The Community Resilience Approach to Disaster Recovery; Strategies Communities can Use. In R. A. Cnaan and C. Milofsky (eds.), Handbook of Community Movements and Local

Organizations in the 21st Century, Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77416-9\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77416-9_23)

Reviewer #3 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

This manuscript, "A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience," appealed to and fulfilled the Journal's aims and scope. The article was based on a clear theoretical framework. Besides the positive impression, some comments were raised. The authors should take a moderate revision.

1. In the introduction section, the authors explained why individual resilience in Indonesia's slum dwellers is essential due to the disaster-environment condition. Regarding wellbeing, the authors mentioned the connection of relatives or long-time neighbors. Adding previous studies' findings about the relation connection in Indonesia will clarify it.

Also, as the authors stated in the introduction and theoretical framework sections, the family and community protective factors may mediate relationships positively between relational wellbeing dimensions and individual resilience. Nevertheless, I understand that Indonesia represents a collectivist culture. Suppose such culture is one of this study's bases. In that case, the authors could describe more about the importance of relatives and neighbors (community), which might relate to the collectivist efficacy.

2. The authors believed the study contributed to an improved understanding of the complex intertwining of wellbeing and resilience, especially by which family and community support determine individual adaptability in their slum communities (p. 24). But how may the study results contribute to developing interventions and policies to build resilient communities and improve the wellbeing of the slum dwellers (p. 4)?

3. The authors assessed demographic information to ensure individual characteristics would not affect the relations in their study (p. 18). Instead, the differences in individual characteristics (age, gender, educational level, and income level) may contribute to individual resilience and how they are perhaps (albeit weakly) related to the main analysis.

Minor revision

1. The authors explain briefly about the RISE project. Is the name in abbreviation? (p. 11).

2. In the Method section, the authors stated that 700 participants were interviewed by questionnaire. The authors could describe the average duration for the participants to complete the interview/questionnaires and may address the total number of items used in this study.

When submitting your revised manuscript online, please include the following:

## **IMPORTANT: EDITORIAL CHECKS AND REQUESTS**

**In addition to addressing any referee comments, before resubmitting please ensure you have:**

- Fully anonymised all your article files\* — see [these guidelines](#) on how to do this.

- Provided a rebuttal letter with a detailed point-by-point response to each of the Editor's and reviewers' comments and a clear description of any changes made in the revised paper. If you have not made changes in response to any of the feedback, please provide full reasoning. The rebuttal letter must be anonymised. Some guidance on writing your letter can be found [here](#).
- Provided a marked-up version of the revised manuscript with the changes highlighted in colour. You may use line numbers. Please do not include track changes or comment boxes.
- Provided a clean version of the revised manuscript in an editable format (e.g. Word or Tex) with line numbers.
- Submitted your article file(s) in an editable format (e.g., word or latex — not PDF).
- Included ALL of the following statements, irrespective of the research you report: Ethical Approval, Informed Consent, Competing Interests, Author Contributions, and Data Availability. If these statements include identifying information, please add a redacted version in the manuscript file, and full versions in a cover letter. Where ethical approval has been granted, full details of the ethics committee and ethical approval number must be provided.
- Provided access to all relevant data generated and/or analysed in your study — whether qualitative or quantitative in nature. This can be done either in a supplementary file or via deposition of datasets in an open repository. If you have valid reasons for not being able to share your data, please ensure that you provide a full explanation in the Data Availability statement. If your research does not involve the analysis or generation of any data, please simply state so.

Please consult this [checklist](#) for more guidance on each of the above points.

\*Note: We understand that rendering some papers fully anonymous may not always be possible, and we continue to support researchers who may wish to release data early, utilise preprint servers, or discuss their work at conferences. We consider it the full responsibility of the author to anonymise their files. Submissions, deemed otherwise suitable for consideration, will not be rejected due to lack of complete anonymisation of files, supporting materials or data.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



Outlook

---

**HSSCOMMS-16034R Receipt of revised MS by Humanities and Social Sciences Communications.**

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Wed 11/29/2023 6:19 AM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034R

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

This message is to confirm that your revised manuscript HSSCOMMS-16034R entitled "A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience" by [author information removed for double blind peer review] has now passed our revision quality check and has been passed to the Editors for their consideration.

You may check on the status of this manuscript by selecting the "Check Manuscript Status" link under the following URL:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A2Cd6GgO4B4azQ5F6A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A2Cd6GgO4B4azQ5F6A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ)

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

Yours sincerely,

Assistant Editor  
Humanities & Social Sciences

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents*

*is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com> .*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



---

## HSSCOMMS-16034R: Major Revision

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Mon 2/12/2024 6:38 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

 1 attachment (49 KB)

18422\_1\_attachment\_confidential\_review\_345753\_s4trhw.pdf;

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034R

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

Thank you for submitting the above paper to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

We have now completed peer review on your paper – this was overseen by a handling Editor.

The Editor has requested 'major revisions', the full details of which are outlined at the bottom of this letter.

We invite you to evaluate the comments carefully and if you feel you can address the issues identified, we would welcome a revision. A revision would be sent out again for review, but I cannot guarantee it will be accepted for publication.

A judgement on suitability for publication would be based on whether the Editor and reviewers conclude their initial comments have been addressed satisfactorily, and to what degree they feel your paper meets the journal's [criteria for acceptance](#).

### SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

**We strongly recommend submitting your revision within approximately 28 days of the receipt of this message to ensure your work can be processed and therefore potentially published speedily.** The latest available re-submission date for your work is 12th Apr 24 - if you need more time than this latter date, please email the editorial office.

Please ensure that your revision is FULLY aligned with the journal's guidelines, which are outlined in the checklist at the foot of this message. If your files are not correctly formatted, we will return them to you for modification. This will inevitably delay the processing of your submission.

Please click on the link below to submit the revision online:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A4Cd1GqO6B1azQ711A9ftdF7U2fgTB3Zkn65lcd84QZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A4Cd1GqO6B1azQ711A9ftdF7U2fgTB3Zkn65lcd84QZ)

Lastly, this is a reminder that this publication is an open-access journal that uses an article processing charge (APC) model payable on acceptance for publication. Full details on that policy can be found [here](#).

Thank you for submitting this paper to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

Yours sincerely,

Gino D'Oca

Chief Editor  
Humanities and Social Sciences Communications

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

---

### Editorial office notes

Please note that editor and referee feedback is reproduced below verbatim as it was received by the editorial office. The feedback represents the perspectives of the anonymous handling editor and referees, unless otherwise stated.

Editors and referees may sometimes recommend published works to read or cite. Please be aware that you are under NO obligation to cite works or resources. These should be considered only suggestions.

---

### Editor and referee comments

Associate Editor (Remarks to Author (required)):

I appreciate that the authors have tried to clarify the revisions previously, however there are still several weaknesses in the paper. Specifically: I appreciate that the authors have chosen to focus on individual resilience (and why this is important) however, given that the context is disaster-vulnerable communities like slums, I, like the first reviewer feel it is important to also incorporate a more robust analysis of collective resilience to fully capture the community-level dynamics. This small section: We posit that individual resilience is just as pivotal as community resilience in mitigating flood risks, owing to individual's inherent capacity to act as agentic operators in their own lives (Bandura, 1999). In this regard, individuals' internal systems, encompassing sensory and cerebral mechanisms, as well as external factors, like family and community, are viewed as tools guiding their decision-making process. To echo Bandura's assertion, "Persons are neither

autonomous agents nor simply mechanical conveyers of animating environmental influences" (1999, p.22). Consequently, individual resilience serves as a bridge toward constructing a high level of community resilience, reflecting the confidence to collaboratively address challenges rather than a mere summation of individual resilience within the community. Does not adequately demonstrate individual resilience as a bridge to construct community resilience – Yet neither do you measure whether individual resilience facilitates Ps to collaboratively address challenges. This needs to be clearer with evidence to back up the claims. Especially given that the authors state the importance of collective resilience and how they are intertwined and should not be teased apart throughout the paper (e.g. , "Persons are neither autonomous agents nor simply mechanical conveyers of animating environmental influences" (1999, p.22)

as well as ""Furthermore, resilience extends beyond the individual or social context to encompass the ability of systems to successfully adapt to emerging challenges (Masten, 2021; Southwick et al., 2014). This versatility has led to the application of resilience across diverse disciplines, ranging from engineering to the social sciences and ecology. " And then this "A notable evolution in this discourse is the transition from a focus on individuals' capacity to bounce back to an emphasis on dynamic systems' ability to adeptly respond to emerging challenges (Masten, 2021). The term "system" encompasses a broad spectrum, spanning from regional and community entities to individual homes and even ecological systems (Chapin et al., 2009)" The first extract highlights that resilience extends beyond just individuals or social contexts to include systems' ability to adapt to challenges. This suggests a broader perspective that includes both individual and systemic resilience. The second extract discuss the evolution of the discourse surrounding resilience, moving from a focus solely on individuals to an emphasis on dynamic systems' ability to respond to challenges. Again, this suggests that resilience is needed at the individual level AND at the level of broader systems, including communities, regions, and ecological systems. However, the paper focusses specifically on individual resilience. What is missing here is concrete evidence and rationale to support claims, especially regarding the cascading effects on social connections and community adaptability, given that the cited paper by Chaigneau and colleagues specifically argues that, evidence suggests, wellbeing and resilience can work against each other, and highlight that both need to be considered as multidimensional factors. The paper needs a section that demonstrates through research how collective resilience complements individual resilience (or vice versa) in disaster-vulnerable communities. Ultimately making a clear case for why a specific focus on individual resilience alone is necessary – where is the evidence supporting the pivotal role of individual resilience in shaping decision-making processes and its implications for urban development in flood resilience contexts?

## 2) Research Design & Sampling:

More information about the RISE project and how it relates to the variables measured should be provided to enhance understanding. Such as dataset population, was anyone / groups excluded? Why/ How?

## 3) Clarity on Wellbeing, Resilience and Religiosity:

Reviewer 1 raises valid concerns regarding the clarity of the discussion on religiosity and its dual role in individuals' lives. I agree. It is essential to differentiate between the role and impact of religiosity to provide a nuanced understanding – especially given the inverse relationship found (see below). The authors should revise this section to clearly articulate the distinction and provide more explicit evidence supporting their arguments.

## 4) Measures and Analysis:

While the reduction of scale items is justified, the specific criteria used for item removal are not clearly explained. Providing more transparency regarding the decision-making process would enhance the methodological rigor.

## 5) Measures:

Individual Resilience: I'm not clear on why the authors chose the measures they did for certain variables. For example the autonomy dimension includes measures of efficacy and pro-active problem solving, but doesn't include a sense of personal agency, ability to make independent

decisions, sense of control/ freedom of choice, or self-regulation.

Protective Factors: The concept of protective factors is appropriately defined, aligning with theoretical frameworks of resilience. However, the merging of dimensions within family and community protective factors should be justified more explicitly, as it may impact the interpretation of results.

Furthermore, the authors state that community protective factors are made up of statements such as: "Apart from my family, the people around me care about me" and "Apart from my family, other people encourage me to do my best" However, neither of these examples actually include the word 'community' how do the authors know that 'people around me' and 'other people' are understood as one's community?

#### 6) Analysis and Results:

Multi-Mediation Analysis: More details on the specific mediation models tested (e.g., serial vs. parallel mediation) would provide important insights into the underlying causal mechanisms and enhance the clarity and robustness of the analysis in understanding the relationships between relational wellbeing dimensions, protective factors, and individual resilience.

Interpretation of Results: The interpretation of results is generally clear and logically presented. However, caution should be exercised when interpreting coefficients, particularly those with small effect sizes. For example, the interpretation of negative coefficients in mediation pathways should be nuanced to avoid overgeneralisation. The authors state that "Community protective factor was found to negatively mediate all the relations between relational wellbeing dimensions and individual resilience, except for religiosity ( $b=.05$ ,  $p=.00$ )."

Typically, mediation analysis examines the indirect effect of a mediator (in this case, the community protective factor) on the relationship between an independent variable (relational wellbeing dimensions) and a dependent variable (individual resilience). A negative coefficient in mediation analysis does not necessarily mean negative mediation; it could indicate suppression or mediation in the opposite direction (See further below).

The authors state that "This particular protective factor was inversely and strongly associated with individual resilience, ( $b=-.26$ ,  $p=.00$ )."

While a negative coefficient ( $-0.26$ ) suggests an inverse association between the community protective factor and individual resilience, the term "strongly associated" is subjective and should be supported by effect size metrics or comparison with other coefficients. Furthermore, the authors do not state what is acceptable for effect sizes within this context. This is necessary to determine the validity of the results, especially when coefficients are small.

Therefore, the conclusion that "even when individuals have positive relations between their relational wellbeing, e.g., in terms of their family and community participation, security within the community and their community, they are still likely to have a decreased level of individual resilience" is premature and requires further analysis or contextualisation.

The negative association between the community protective factor and individual resilience may indicate a need for more nuanced interpretation? or indeed in the context here, the fact that religiosity is measured as a component of relational wellbeing and is positively associated with individual resilience, could suggest that the inverse relationship is due to individuals with higher levels of religiosity, exhibiting greater resilience in the Presence of weaker community protective factors. Interaction effects or sub-group analysis can look at this.

The authors go on to state that "Based on this, we conclude that there is partial evidence to support the hypothesis that the relations between relational wellbeing dimensions and individual resilience are positively mediated by family and community protective factors (H1-3)".

The conclusion is contradictory to the earlier statement that the community protective factor negatively mediated all relations. If the mediation effect is negative, it does not align with the hypothesis of positive mediation by family and community protective factors.

The authors also state that "family protective factors positively mediate both relational wellbeing dimensions and individual resilience" – the rest of the paper, however, suggests that family protective factors explain the relationship between wellbeing and resilience rather than mediating

the relationship between each of the specific dimensions of wellbeing and resilience. Clarity is needed here.

Furthermore, while the authors discuss the fit indices from the CFA, they do not provide specific information about model modification indices or potential sources of misfit that were addressed during model refinement. Including this information would enhance the transparency of the validation process.

#### 7) Clarity and Evidence in Hypotheses and Measurement:

Following H1:

the relational wellbeing dimensions operationalized by participation in family and community, security and competition between groups, material satisfaction, social access and facilities, religiosity and self-concept are positively related to individual resilience (H1).

The author's state: "The extant literature has shown that family and community factors provide protective resources for individuals in times of adversity. When individuals feel that their social relationships provide positive interaction and respond positively to their needs, they will show empathy, be more responsive and freely communicate their needs (Miller-Graff, 2022).

Furthermore, when individuals feel that their communities provide alternative solutions to solve their problems (e.g., employment choices), people are given a chance to think independently about choosing the right decision to deal with their problems (Southwick et al., 2014). While all these resources may be taken for granted in mundane life, scholars agree that these are essential factors helping people develop their resilience and that will come evident in times of adversity, including in overcoming daily hardships (Benard, 1991; Miller-Graff, 2022; Authors, 2022a)".

But I am struggling to see how this relates specifically to flooding and sea-level rise? Especially given that such climatic change will likely impact the community as a whole - thus their communities would not, perhaps, provide solutions to solve problems - and would therefore, negatively affect individual resilience?

The authors then go on to Say "In the meantime, individuals' evaluation towards their life achievement so far is expected to relate to the individuals' evaluation towards their relationships with family and community. Those who perceive themselves as being independent in attaining their own aspirations, while considering their social relationships are likely to evaluate their relationships with the family and community positively. Consequently, individuals are likely to perceive that they receive the necessary conditions, e.g., warm and caring relationships, to allow them to develop a desired level of individual resilience."

However, I am struggling to get on board with this argument. The authors are suggesting that one's evaluation of life achievements is related to the evaluation of one's family and community relationships - this I can get on board with - The more positive my family and community relationships are, the more I feel a sense of achievement. You then go on to state that if I perceive my achievements as independent from family and community, I will the more positively evaluate my family and community relationships - this I am not so convinced with? You then go on to suggest that as a result of perceiving achievements to be independent of family and community relationships, individuals will feel as though they receive more warmth and caring conditions that foster individual resilience? I do not see the connections here.

#### 8) Conclusion and Implications:

The conclusion drawn from the results is generally supported by the data, although the limitations of the analysis should be acknowledged, including potential biases in sampling methods, potential biases inherent in self-report measures and the complexity of mediation models and cross-sectional designs. Accordingly, recommendations for future research could be expanded to include addressing methodological limitations and exploring additional moderators or mediators, such as further investigating the impact of social norms on protective factors.

The authors state that "the negative relation between community protective factor and individual resilience is also confirmed in Table 2" – Table 2 does not do this? In addition general convention is to report  $p=.00$  as  $p<.001$ . There are several mistakes and errors throughout like this.

Conclusion:

Overall, the paper makes a significant contribution to the literature on resilience and wellbeing in vulnerable communities. With further refinement to address the identified areas for improvement, particularly in conceptual clarity and discussion depth, the paper has the potential to offer valuable insights for both research and practice. Therefore, it is recommended that the authors revise the manuscript to address these points before considering publication.

Reviewer #1 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

I appreciate that the authors have made some changes in regard to the feedback. The manuscript in its current form has improved as it has a clear focus on resilience in the context of daily lives of slum dwellers.

However, the authors' response on religiosity and the dual role of religion on people's lives is still not clear. There is a distinct difference between the notion of role and impact (of religion on one's life). The revised paragraph that discusses the dual role of religion does not seem clearly differentiate between the meaning of role and impact. They are not the same. The use of term "paradox" in the sentences added to the paragraph implies more the meaning of different impact (and viewpoint), not role of religion. The brief report from rapport building interviews that presented in the paragraph does not clearly convey the dual role of religion on people's lives.

---

## Formatting and editorial checks

**In addition to addressing any referee comments, before resubmitting please ensure you have:**

- Fully anonymised all your article files\* — see [these guidelines](#) on how to do this.
- Provided a rebuttal letter with a detailed point-by-point response to each of the Editor's and reviewers' comments and a clear description of any changes made in the revised paper. If you have not made changes in response to any of the feedback, please provide full reasoning. The rebuttal letter must be anonymised. Some guidance on writing your letter can be found [here](#).
- Provided a marked-up version of the revised manuscript with the changes highlighted in colour. You may use line numbers. Please do not include track changes or comment boxes.
- Provided a clean version of the revised manuscript in an editable format (e.g. Word or Tex) with line numbers.
- Submitted your article file(s) in an editable format (e.g., word or latex — not PDF).
- Included ALL of the following statements, irrespective of the research you report: Ethical Approval, Informed Consent, Competing Interests, Author Contributions, and Data

Availability. If these statements include identifying information, please add a redacted version in the manuscript file, and full versions in a cover letter. Where ethical approval has been granted, full details of the ethics committee and ethical approval number must be provided.

- Provided access to all relevant data generated and/or analysed in your study — whether qualitative or quantitative in nature. This can be done either in a supplementary file or via deposition of datasets in an open repository. If you have valid reasons for not being able to share your data, please ensure that you provide a full explanation in the Data Availability statement. If your research does not involve the analysis or generation of any data, please simply state so.

Please consult this [checklist](#) for more guidance on each of the above points.

\*Note: We understand that rendering some papers fully anonymous may not always be possible, and we continue to support researchers who may wish to release data early, utilise preprint servers, or discuss their work at conferences. We consider it the full responsibility of the author to anonymise their files. Submissions, deemed otherwise suitable for consideration, will not be rejected due to lack of complete anonymisation of files, supporting materials or data.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



---

**HSSCOMMS-16034R1 Receipt of revised MS by Humanities and Social Sciences Communications.**

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Fri 4/12/2024 2:11 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034R1

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

This message is to confirm that your revised manuscript HSSCOMMS-16034R1 entitled "A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience" by [author information removed for double blind peer review] has now passed our revision quality check and has been passed to the Editors for their consideration.

You may check on the status of this manuscript by selecting the "Check Manuscript Status" link under the following URL:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A6Cd7GqO6C6azQ2F4A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A6Cd7GqO6C6azQ2F4A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ)

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

Yours sincerely,

Assistant Editor  
Humanities & Social Sciences

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents*

*is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com> .*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



---

## HSSCOMMS-16034R1: Accepted In Principle

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Tue 6/25/2024 1:13 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

 1 attachment (202 KB)

recommendation\_attachment\_1\_1719302532.pdf;

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034R1

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

Thank you once again for submitting the above manuscript to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

We have now completed an assessment of your research; this was overseen by an Associate Editor.

In light of their advice, I can confirm that we would be happy, in principle, to publish your work.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING CAREFULLY

We now invite you to submit your manuscript one last time, ensuring that you have addressed any outstanding requests (noted below, if applicable) from the editor or referees, and that your files FULLY adhere to our editorial guidelines.

We have not set a revision date, but recommend you resubmit within four working days from receipt of this message. This will ensure we can proceed to publication as quickly as possible thereafter. If you require longer, you do not need to inform us, unless you plan to take more than 60 days.

Please note that your manuscript has NOT yet been formally accepted for publication. Final editorial checks will be conducted on your resubmitted article files. The editors reserve the right to rescind this 'accept in principle' decision if deemed appropriate.

**At the foot of this message\*, we include a detailed list of essential formatting checks that you need to make before resubmitting.**

If your manuscript files fail to meet ANY of these requirements they will NOT be judged 'typesetting-ready' and the editorial team will have to return them to you. This will delay the publication of your paper as it will be processed at a lower priority to submissions that are correctly formatted. **Failure to comply with the journal's formatting requirements is the most common**

**cause of delays to publication. Please consider ALL requirements carefully.**

Once you have made all the checks listed below, please click on this link to submit your file(s):

<https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A2Cd4GqO2C3azQ7I7A9ftdF7U2fgTB3Zkn65lcd84QZ>

Thank you again for submitting your research to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

Please be reminded that this journal is an open-access publication that uses an article processing charge (APC) model payable on acceptance for publication. Full details on that policy can be found [here](#).

Yours sincerely,

Gino D'Oca

Chief Editor  
Humanities and Social Sciences Communications

**Important:** Please check your email set up to ensure that the journal email address (hsscomms@springernature.com) is not later blacklisted or rejected as 'spam'. Failure to do this may result in you not receiving important emails from the editorial team on the status of your paper.

---

### Editorial office notes

Please note that editor and referee feedback is reproduced below verbatim as it was received by the editorial office. The feedback represents the perspectives of the anonymous\* handling editor and referees, unless otherwise stated.

Editors and referees may sometimes recommend published works to read or cite. Please be aware that you are under NO obligation to reference works or resources. These should be considered only as suggestions.

\*While we operate an anonymous review policy, referees have the right to waive anonymity if they desire. If a referee's name is shared, it is because they requested this.

---

### Editor and referee comments

Associate Editor (Remarks to Author (required)):

Congratulations! However, there are several typos in the document that need addressing. I have made some tracked changes in the uploaded document. Please go through the final submission meticulously to check for any further errors.

## Reviewer #1 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

The revised manuscripts seems to have overlooked a fundamental notion of disaster-prone areas that links individual resilience with community resilience: (the prevailing) risks. Here and there, it tends to posit disaster-prone areas in terms of impacts and challenges. Risk and impact are two different notions. Disaster risk comes before the occurrence of a disaster. Disaster impacts are known as disasters that occur. Community-level dynamics and community/collective resilience prevail as individuals, as community members, work toward reducing or managing disaster risks. The new section on community resilience is lacking in underscoring that disaster risks, whether real or perceived, link individual resilience with community resilience.

## Reviewer #3 (Comments to the Author (Required)):

The authors have addressed all comments from the previous round of review.

---

**Formatting and editorial checks**

\*NB: PLEASE READ THESE REQUIREMENTS AND CAREFULLY CHECK ALL YOUR MANUSCRIPT FILES BEFORE RE-SUBMISSION TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE.

**ESSENTIAL FINAL EDITORIAL CHECKS AND REQUESTS**

**In addition to addressing any editor/referee comments (above), before resubmitting please ensure you have:**

- Reinstated all author information (names, emails, and affiliations - NOT biographies) one page 1 of your Article file. **Please note that we will NOT permit the addition of new authors to your paper.**
- Uploaded one final version of the manuscript (WITHOUT line numbers or coloured highlighting) in an editable format (e.g. txt, doc, docx, tex formats only - not PDF).
- Conducted a final proofread (language and grammar check) of your manuscript files. Ensure your article title is written in sentence case (e.g., 'A study on farming' - NOT: 'A Study On Farming') and your abstract comprises one paragraph without subheadings or reference citations.
- Submitted, if applicable, any figures as separate files (one file per figure) in an editable format (e.g. eps, tiff, jpg, png only), with all figure legends listed at the end of the article file after the references.
- Included ALL of the following FIVE separate statements after the references section IN THE ARTICLE FILE (NOT as separate files) - this applies irrespective of the research you report: Ethical Approval, Informed Consent, Competing Interests, Author Contributions, and Data Availability. These statements MUST be detailed and informative (e.g., include ethical

approval committee names and numbers). If any of these sections do not apply, please write in sentence form, for instance, 'Ethical approval was not required as the study did not involve human participants'. Please do not write 'not applicable'.

- Deleted from the submission system ALL old or redundant versions of manuscript files.
- Uploaded, if applicable, any supplementary information (e.g. appendices or similar), as SEPARATE file(s) with a cover page noting the article title and author names. NB: This information must NOT be included in the main article file.
- Provided full open access to any data analysed or generated in your study, or at least made clear how readers can access them. This journal is a strong advocate for the open sharing of research 'data', which we take to mean any materials underpinning a body of research, whether qualitative or quantitative in nature. In the spirit of ensuring greater transparency and reproducibility in academic research, we strongly encourage you to provide access to all relevant underlying data and materials either via a supplementary file, or in line with 'best practice', through deposition in a suitable repository (learn more about how to do this [here](#)). The journal operates its [own](#) open data repository that you are welcome to use too. If you are not able to share your data, please make the reasons clear in the 'data availability' statement. If your research does not involve the analysis or generation of any data, please simply state so.

The above requirements are outlined and expanded upon in our [submission guidelines](#).

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



Outlook

---

**HSSCOMMS-16034R2 Approved MS Received**

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Wed 7/3/2024 4:24 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

Dear Dr Setiawan,

On 3rd Jul 24, the manuscript entitled "A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience" by [author information removed for double blind peer review] was approved by the author.

The manuscript has been assigned the Paper #: HSSCOMMS-16034R2.

You may check on the status of this manuscript by selecting the "Check Manuscript Status" link under the following URL:

[https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?  
el=A2Cd5GqO5D6azQ7F7A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ](https://mts-palcomms.nature.com/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A2Cd5GqO5D6azQ7F7A9ftdCoA6R76nyxbSfEGaa4yPwZ)

(Press/Click on the above link to be automatically sent to the web page.)

Sincerely,

The Editorial Office  
Humanities & Social Sciences Communications

**Note:** This journal uses an Open Access model including an Article Processing Charge (APC) for papers accepted for publication. You can learn more about our policies [here](#). If you have any questions, please let us know.

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

*Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here <http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>*

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



---

**HSSCOMMS-16034R2: Accepted for Publication**

---

**From** hsscomms@springernature.com <hsscomms@springernature.com>

**Date** Mon 7/8/2024 7:43 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

Manuscript Number: HSSCOMMS-16034R2

Title: A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience

Authors: [author information removed for double blind peer review]

Dear Dr Setiawan,

I am pleased to inform you that your above manuscript has now been accepted for publication in *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*.

We expect your paper to be published within approximately four to six weeks, subject to the timely completion of the documents mentioned below, and approval of your typeset proofs. If you have questions about the publication date for your paper please contact [ORGProduction@nature.com](mailto:ORGProduction@nature.com).

Please note there will be no further correspondence about your publication date. When your article is published, you will receive a notification email.

**\*\*\*PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES CAREFULLY\*\*\***

**LICENCE TO PUBLISHING AND ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE**

Within approximately 14 business days you will receive an email with a link to choose the grant of rights necessary for publishing your paper and – if applicable – to provide payment information for your article-processing charge (APC), either via credit card or by requesting an invoice.

If applicable, our Author Services team will be in touch regarding any additional information that may be required.

**In order to avoid any delays, please ensure that you have emails from Springer Nature whitelisted in your mail system.**

If you have any questions about our publishing options, costs, Open Access requirements, or our legal forms, please contact [ASJournals@springernature.com](mailto:ASJournals@springernature.com) — and not the journal editorial team.

More details on the journal's open access policy can be found [here](#).

**APPROVING YOUR TYPESET PROOFS**

Once your manuscript has been typeset you will receive an email directing you to our online proofing site where you will be able to check the PDF proof. Please read and follow the instructions carefully, and send back any changes as directed. The typesetters do NOT conduct an in-depth copy edit of your paper. It is your responsibility to ensure the text reads clearly.

**Since this will be your last chance to check the paper before publication we strongly recommend carrying out a thorough proofread to identify and address any outstanding issues.** Beyond this, you will NOT have a further opportunity to request amendments.

Please note that extensive changes to the text, such as the introduction of new material, figures or data, are NOT permitted at this post-acceptance stage. The editorial team reserves the right to rescind the acceptance decision if it is felt changes alter the manuscript substantively.

**Changes to author lists and orders are NOT permitted from this point.** We are also unable to add additional ORCID details to your paper.

If your paper included mention of reviewers, editors, or collection editors, then these will be removed by the editorial team before typesetting. Our journal policy does not permit such statements.

For further information on the journey of your article from acceptance to publication, please see [these](#) guidelines.

## EMBARGOED PRESS RELEASES

If you are planning an embargoed press release or require a specific publication date, please complete our [scheduling requests form](#), or contact ORGProduction@nature.com, as soon as possible after acceptance and we will endeavour to accommodate your request. Please note that the paper is still under embargo until it is published in the journal. Further details of our embargo policy can be found [here](#).

## PUBLICATION AND BEYOND

Your paper will be published on the journal [website](#). Within 48 hours of publication a 'metrics'\* tab will also be generated for your paper. This will be accessible beneath the article title.

Your paper will be published under a [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) License](#), which permits maximum dissemination and use. We, therefore, encourage you to consider promoting your research using social media and services such as Academia.edu and Mendeley and ResearchGate.

If you had posted an earlier version of your article on a personal blog, a collaborative wiki or a preprint server, we ask you to replace it with the published version. This will help ensure that the published article becomes the 'version of record' and that your work is consistently and correctly cited.

Your paper will likely also be highlighted on the journal's [X \(formerly known as Twitter\) feed](#). Please consider tagging the journal using @HSScomms in any posts made by you or your institution.

Shortly after publication, your paper will be distributed to third party indexing services. You can find an up-to-date list of these [here](#).

## CORRECTIONS POST PUBLICATION

Occasionally, authors identify errors or mistakes in their published article. To minimise the likelihood of this occurring, we strongly recommend taking the time to check your manuscript text thoroughly and carefully when you receive the proof for approval (see above notes).

Minor errors (e.g., typographical mistakes or similar) do NOT qualify for post-publication correction.

Formal correction notices are only published in instances where the academic integrity of the study is substantively undermined by a mistake introduced by the authors or typesetters, or serious factual errors need to be rectified (e.g. incorrect author affiliations or wrongly spelled author names).

The journal's Correction policy is outlined [here](#).

---

Thank you very much for submitting your work to *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. We hope you will consider the journal again for future submissions.

Yours sincerely,

Gino D'Oca

Chief Editor  
Humanities and Social Sciences Communications

Additional notes:

\* All published articles include article-level metrics (ALMs), thanks to our partnership with Altmetric. ALMs track and analyse the online activity surrounding scholarly literature, showing detailed statistics on: each article's coverage and discussions in the media and on blogs; any bookmarking, ratings and discussions via bibliographic tools and sites such as Papers, Mendeley and ResearchGate; and social media sharing via platforms like Twitter, Facebook and Google+. These metrics provide additional insights into the reach and impact of individual articles.

### **Apply to join our Editorial Board**

We are currently inviting applications from academics to join our international [Editorial Bboard](#).

If you would like to express an interest, please complete this [form](#).

This email has been sent through the Springer Nature Tracking System NY-610A-NPG&MTS

#### *Confidentiality Statement:*

*This e-mail is confidential and subject to copyright. Any unauthorised use or disclosure of its contents is prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify our Manuscript Tracking System Helpdesk team at <http://platformsupport.nature.com>.*

*Details of the confidentiality and pre-publicity policy may be found here*  
<http://www.nature.com/authors/policies/confidentiality.html>

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Update Profile](#)



Outlook

---

**Your open access article is ready to view and share**

---

**From** Springer Nature <alerts@springernature.com>

**Date** Fri 7/19/2024 11:01 PM

**To** Setiawan, T. (Tery) <tery.setiawan@ru.nl>

You don't often get email from alerts@springernature.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Springer Nature

# Your article has been published!

We know what it takes to research, write, and publish your manuscript. It's contributions like yours that advance knowledge in the global research community.

## See what you can do as an author with us:

- \* track the impact of your article
- \* tell the story [behind the paper](#) to your community
- \* share your article link to anyone around the world

**Go to your account**

**Your article is ready to be viewed, downloaded, and cited.**

**[A dual pathway for understanding the relation between wellbeing and resilience](#)**

Humanities and Social Sciences Communications

10.1057/s41599-024-03440-4

**[View and download your article](#)**

Share your article on social media:

Thank you for publishing with us,

**Springer Nature**

If you have any questions, please visit our support pages at

[support.springernature.com](https://support.springernature.com) or email Author Support on

[authorsupport@springernature.com](mailto:authorsupport@springernature.com)

© Springer Nature 2024