



# Prediction of Self-Harming Thoughts Based on Early Maladaptive Schemas and Mindfulness

Shohrehalsadat Filsouf<sup>1</sup>, Tayebe Ardi<sup>2\*</sup>, Elham Mahmodiyan<sup>3</sup>, Sevin Esmaelzadeh<sup>4</sup>, Hanieh Forghani Heris<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Nursing, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, ToJ.C., Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Jam Branch, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of General Psychology, Ga.C., Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

<sup>4</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, Khoy.C., Islamic Azad University, Khoy, Iran

<sup>5</sup> Department of Personality Psychology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: m-abbaszadeh@tabrizu.ac.ir

---

## Editor

Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez  
Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Autonomous University of Occident, Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico  
felipe.reynoso@uadeo.mx

## Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Yaghub Badriazarin  
Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran.  
Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir  
Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada.  
Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph of the Introduction, the authors state that self-harm “includes intentional physical injury to the body without suicidal intent,” but later define self-harming thoughts as including “a spectrum ranging from vague thoughts about the possibility of ending life to completed suicide.” These two definitions refer to different constructs: non-suicidal self-injury and suicidal ideation. The introduction should separate these constructs explicitly and justify why a suicide-ideation instrument is appropriate for the study’s stated construct.

In the Methods paragraph under “Participants,” the manuscript states that the statistical population included individuals over 18 who referred to clinics in Tehran during “the third three-month period of 1404,” while the Abstract states the third quarter of 2025. This date conversion appears inconsistent, because the third quarter of Iranian year 1404 does not directly correspond to the third quarter of 2025. The authors should correct the calendar conversion and use one clear reporting convention throughout the manuscript.

In the “Sampling Method” paragraph, the authors state that “300 participants were selected based on the sample-size table proposed by Krejcie and Morgan.” For a correlational regression study, a general population table is less appropriate than a priori power analysis based on the expected effect size, number of predictors, desired power, and alpha level. The authors should either provide a power analysis or justify why the Krejcie and Morgan table is suitable for this clinical-regression design.

In the “Sampling Method” paragraph, the statement “Using simple random sampling” needs methodological substantiation. In clinic-based research, true simple random sampling requires a complete sampling frame of all eligible clients and a random selection procedure. The authors should describe how eligible participants were listed, how randomization was performed, how refusals were handled, and how many clients were approached, excluded, declined, and finally analyzed.

In the “Research Instruments” paragraph on the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills, the authors cite original reliability coefficients but do not report reliability in the present sample. Because the study’s main conclusions depend on KIMS subscales, the authors should report Cronbach’s alpha or preferably omega for the total scale and each subscale in the current dataset, and should confirm whether the Persian version used has established validity in Iranian samples.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Introduction paragraph beginning “One of the most important variables that has attracted researchers’ attention,” the explanation of mindfulness is useful, but it remains descriptive rather than theoretically linked to self-harming thoughts. The authors should explain the specific mechanism by which mindfulness may reduce suicidal or self-harming ideation, such as decentering, reduced cognitive fusion, emotion regulation, distress tolerance, or lower rumination, and then connect these mechanisms directly to the selected KIMS subscales.

In the Introduction paragraph beginning “In contrast to mindfulness-based approaches,” the schema theory discussion states that schemas “are classified into five main domains,” yet the Methods section reports use of a 75-item YSQ-SF with 15 subscales. The authors should clarify how the 15 schemas were mapped into the five domains, whether this mapping follows a validated scoring procedure, and whether domain scores were computed by averaging relevant schema subscales or using another method.

In the Introduction paragraph that begins “The relationship between these two constructs,” the authors write that mindfulness “can act as a moderating factor or even a therapeutic mechanism,” but the study only tests direct prediction through correlation and simultaneous regression. The theoretical framing should be revised so that it matches the actual analytic model, or alternatively the authors should test moderation or mediation formally if they intend to claim interactive or mechanistic effects.

The Introduction contains several lengthy paragraphs describing each schema domain, such as the paragraph beginning “In the domain of disconnection and rejection” and continuing through multiple domain descriptions. These sections read like textbook summaries rather than a focused empirical rationale. The authors should shorten these descriptions and instead emphasize prior empirical evidence linking each schema domain to suicidal ideation, self-injury thoughts, affect dysregulation, hopelessness, or maladaptive coping.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.