

Structural Model for Predicting Psychological Well-being and Emotional Regulation Based on Resilience and Self-Efficacy in MS Patients

Raheleh. Joharian¹, Masoumeh. Behboodi^{2*}, Simindokht. Rezakhani³

¹ Ph.D. Student, Department of Counseling, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mabehboodi@gmail.com

Editor

Ahmad Abedi

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology of Children with Special Needs, University of Isfahan, Iran
a.abedi@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei 

Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Mohsen Golparvar

Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. mgolparvar@khuif.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

On page 5, the authors discuss using structural equation modeling (SEM) but do not specify which fit indices were considered to evaluate the model's fit. Please clarify which indices were used and provide threshold values for each to strengthen the methodology section.

The literature review could benefit from a more comprehensive analysis of previous studies linking self-efficacy and emotional regulation, particularly in chronic disease contexts other than MS, to bolster the argument for the model's applicability (p. 3).

On page 6, the description of the purposive sampling method lacks details on how participants were selected within each region. Adding specifics will improve the reproducibility of the study.

The paper could improve by providing a brief rationale for the choice of each psychological scale used (p. 7), particularly why these scales are appropriate for the MS patient population, which could differ significantly in psychological profiles from general populations.

Some figures and tables are referenced in the text but are not clearly labeled or present within the document. Please ensure all figures and tables are correctly referenced and included.

The manuscript lacks discussion on the potential impact of non-responder bias, which is crucial for understanding the generalizability of the findings (p. 9).

The conclusion section could be strengthened by discussing the implications of the research findings for clinical practice and future research, providing a clearer contribution to the existing body of knowledge (p. 11).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

Page 5 discusses SEM analysis without mentioning specific model fit indices like CMIN/DF, CFI, or RMSEA. Please specify these indices to enhance the transparency and reliability of the model evaluation.

The manuscript does not address how missing data was handled during analysis. Detailing this would strengthen the research's methodological rigor (p. 5).

While the scales used are well-recognized, their validation on the specific population of MS patients is not discussed (p. 7). Please provide evidence of this validation to ensure the reliability of the results.

The discussion could be deepened by comparing the study's findings with those of similar studies in different cultural contexts or among different chronic illness populations to highlight unique or corroborative insights (p. 10).

The criteria for including participants in the study need clearer definition. Details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria would help in understanding the study's population better (p. 6).

It would be beneficial to include a more detailed explanation of the statistical techniques and rationales behind choosing specific models and tests, especially for readers who are not familiar with SEM (p. 5).

The theoretical grounding of the study could be enhanced by discussing how the constructs of resilience and self-efficacy interact within the psychological model proposed, thereby providing a deeper theoretical contribution (p. 3).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. **Revised**

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.