KMANPUB Health Nexus Vol. 4 No. 3 (2026)

Article history:
Received 14 February 2026
Revised 28 May 2026
Accepted 05 June 2026
Initial Publication 20 June 2026
Final Publication 01 July 2026

Maternal Early Maladaptive Schemas and Parenting Styles Associated with Maladaptive Cognitive Emotion Regulation Strategies in Girls Aged 9-11 Years

Shirin Alsadat Alavi[1*], Farshid Khosropour[2], Hasan Mohamadtehrani[2]

1. Ph.D Candidate in General Psychology, Zar.C., Islamic Azad University, Zarand, Iran
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Zar.C., Islamic Azad University, Zarand, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address:** shirin.alavi82@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Autonomous University of Occident, Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico felipe.reynoso@uadeo.mx	Reviewer 1: Mehdi Rostami Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Yaghob Badriazarin Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the paragraph beginning with "*Family context is one of the most important developmental environments for children's emotional learning*" provides a strong theoretical rationale for parenting influences; however, the authors should elaborate on the specific mechanisms linking maternal schemas to children's maladaptive cognitive emotion regulation. The theoretical model currently remains largely inferential and would be strengthened by integrating schema transmission theories and social learning mechanisms more explicitly.

The statement in the Introduction that "*the present study focuses specifically on these maladaptive cognitive strategies rather than on general emotion regulation ability*" is appropriate; nevertheless, the authors should justify why only maladaptive strategies were examined. Excluding adaptive cognitive emotion regulation strategies may obscure a more complete understanding of children's emotional functioning and may limit interpretation of the findings.

Table 3 demonstrates positive correlations between maladaptive cognitive emotion regulation and every schema dimension. Such a uniformly consistent pattern raises questions regarding common method variance and conceptual overlap among

constructs. The authors should address this possibility more directly and consider whether some associations may be inflated due to shared response tendencies.

The regression model reported in Table 4 explains 81.8% of the variance (R^2 = .818), which is exceptionally high for psychosocial research involving self-report measures. The Discussion briefly notes the possibility of overfitting; however, this issue warrants a more thorough examination, including potential multicollinearity, redundancy among predictors, and shared method variance.

Several predictors that were significantly correlated with the outcome in Table 3 became nonsignificant in the multivariate model (e.g., emotional deprivation, abandonment, social isolation). The manuscript should provide a more detailed explanation of this discrepancy and discuss whether suppression effects or overlapping variance among schemas may account for these findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The conceptual framework presented in Figure 1 depicts directional arrows from maternal schemas and parenting styles toward girls' maladaptive cognitive emotion regulation. Although the figure includes a note acknowledging the cross-sectional nature of the design, the visual structure may still imply causal direction. Consider revising the figure to use bidirectional or non-directional association indicators to avoid overinterpretation.

In the Methods section, the authors report that the sample size of 181 participants was determined according to Morgan's sample size table. Given that the regression model contains 21 predictors, a more rigorous justification based on statistical power analysis should be provided. The adequacy of the sample size relative to model complexity is a critical methodological issue that deserves further discussion.

The paragraph describing inclusion and exclusion criteria states that participants with "*diagnosis of a psychological disorder according to school health records*" were excluded. The manuscript should clarify how psychological disorders were identified, whether diagnoses were formally established by mental health professionals, and whether school records provided sufficiently reliable and standardized information.

The operationalization of the dependent variable requires further clarification. In the paragraph beginning "*Maladaptive cognitive emotion regulation strategies*," the authors indicate that the outcome was calculated as a composite score derived from four CERQ subscales. Please provide a stronger psychometric justification for aggregating these subscales into a single index rather than examining them separately, as each strategy may reflect distinct cognitive-emotional processes.

The manuscript acknowledges that "*the present study did not conduct a separate age-specific validation or factor analysis of the CERQ in girls aged 9–11 years*." This limitation is important and should be discussed more extensively because the validity of self-reported cognitive emotion regulation strategies in children may differ substantially from that observed in adolescents or adults.

Regarding the measurement of maternal schemas, the manuscript reports only the overall Cronbach's alpha of .91. Since the analyses were conducted at the schema-subscale level, reliability indices for each of the 18 schema dimensions should be presented. This information is necessary to evaluate the precision of the individual predictor variables.

Health Nexus
E-ISSN: 2981-2569

In the Statistical Analysis section, the authors indicate that outliers were screened before analysis, yet no details are provided regarding the criteria used, the number of cases identified, or whether any observations were removed. Transparent reporting of these procedures is necessary for reproducibility and methodological rigor.

Table 2 presents remarkably similar means across the 18 schema dimensions, most ranging between approximately 14 and 15 points. The manuscript should comment on whether this limited variability reflects actual characteristics of the sample, possible ceiling/floor effects, or measurement characteristics of the instrument.

The statement in the Results section that "*all reported correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$*" would benefit from additional reporting of confidence intervals. Reliance solely on p-values may overemphasize statistical significance while providing limited information regarding the precision and practical importance of the observed associations.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

Health Nexus
E-ISSN: 2981-2569