





Prediction of Social Anxiety based on Rumination, Self-Focused Attention, and Social Intimacy in Women

Fatemeh. Ebrahimpour Khartoomi¹, Azam. Ghanbari^{1*}, Nastaran. Kazemian Tarhan¹



¹ M.A, Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: azamghanbari57@yahoo.com

Editor

Shahram Vahedi¹
Professor, Department of
Educational Psychology, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and
Psychology, Tabriz University,
Tabriz, Iran
vahedi117@yahoo.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University,
Arak, Iran.
Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Stephen C. L. Lau¹
Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States.
Email: lauc@wustl.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction, where you state, "Understanding the cognitive and emotional processes that contribute to SAD is crucial for developing effective interventions," it would be beneficial to specify how the focus on women differentiates this study from existing literature to strengthen the rationale.

On p. 3, you describe the cross-sectional study design. It would be clearer to specify why this design was chosen over longitudinal or experimental designs, considering the causal implications of your research questions.

On p. 4, you discuss the use of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale. While you note its reliability, it might be helpful to include information about any known limitations of this scale or why it was preferable over others like the Social Phobia Inventory (SPIN).

While you report p-values extensively, it would be helpful to also report effect sizes (e.g., Cohen's d) to give readers a sense of the practical significance of your findings.

You state that assumptions of linearity, normality, etc., were tested (p. 6). Consider including a visual representation (e.g., residual plots or histograms) in an appendix to enhance the reader's understanding.

The sentence, "Rumination significantly predicts social anxiety," could be expanded to discuss potential mechanisms or theories explaining why this might be the case (e.g., cognitive bias or neurobiological underpinnings).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph that discusses rumination and self-focused attention (p. 1) lacks references to meta-analyses or key longitudinal studies that would provide stronger support for the claims. Including more robust empirical evidence could enhance the argument.

The phrase "intensifies the perception of threats in social situations" on p. 2 is vague. Consider elaborating on how this cognitive process manifests behaviorally in individuals with social anxiety.

It is stated that the RRS and SFAS scales are reliable. Including Cronbach's alpha values for this study's sample would give readers a better understanding of the reliability in your specific context.

The section discussing the ANOVA results (p. 5) mentions Bonferroni post-hoc tests. Clarify why this particular post-hoc test was used and if any alternatives were considered.

When you discuss social intimacy as a buffer (p. 8), compare your findings with those from similar studies that might have differing conclusions. This will situate your results within a broader research context.

On p. 8, where you mention the cross-sectional nature of the study, it is important to emphasize how this impacts causal interpretations and to suggest how future research could address this limitation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.