

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Components of Psychological Well-Being in the Persian Version of the Ryff Scale Across Different Ethnic Groups of Afghan Families

Zarifullah. Ahmadyar¹, Mahmood. Heidari^{2*}, Mohammad Ali. Mazaheri³, Fereshteh. Mootabi⁴

¹ PhD Candidate, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Department of Clinical Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran ² Associate professor, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Department of Clinical Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran ³ Professor, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Department of Clinical Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran ⁴ Assistant Professor, Family Therapy Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mahmood.heidari@gmail.com

Editor	R e v i e w e r s
Sefa Bulut [®] Associate Profesor, Head of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Department, Ibn Haldun University, Turkey sefa.bulut@ihu.edu.tr	Reviewer 1: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri Associate Professor (Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Seyed Ali Darbani Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement, "Psychological well-being, as a comprehensive concept, was defined by Ryff, focusing on enhancing positive states and reducing negative ones," should clarify how Ryff's definition differs from other models of well-being, such as Diener's subjective well-being framework.

The discussion on Ryff's scale translations (e.g., Urdu, Indian, and Swedish versions) lacks an explicit comparison of psychometric findings across these cultural contexts. A synthesis of differences in reliability and factor structures would strengthen the argument for this study's necessity.

The section details linguistic modifications but does not describe whether these changes underwent back-translation for validation. To ensure semantic equivalence, back-translation should be reported if conducted.

The phrase, "Face validity was qualitatively assessed through feedback from eight Afghan university professors," does not specify whether cognitive interviews or pilot testing were conducted with the target population. How were participants' perspectives incorporated into the adaptation?

The demographics discussion states, "Participants came from either extended families (42.7%) or nuclear families (57.3%)." Given cultural norms in Afghanistan, is there a theoretical basis for investigating whether extended versus nuclear family structures influence well-being scores?

The discussion of normality states that the data were non-normally distributed, yet PLS-SEM was chosen. Since PLS-SEM is recommended for non-normal data, it would be useful to explicitly state this as a justification for using this method over covariance-based SEM.

The statement, "These findings indicate that Ryff's six-factor model was not well-supported, urging caution in interpreting its subscales, particularly in non-Western countries," should specify whether cross-loadings or weak factor correlations contributed to this conclusion.

Discussion - Comparisons with Other Studies: Several international validation studies are cited, but there is no detailed comparison with psychometric findings of the Persian version used in Iran. Did the Afghan sample yield similar factor structures, or were notable differences observed?

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement, "Examining this topic can significantly contribute to understanding psychological well-being in Afghan family populations," should explicitly outline the unique sociocultural or linguistic factors that differentiate Afghan populations from Iranian ones, given the existing Persian translation.

The sentence, "Upon obtaining consent, families were requested to complete the questionnaires separately in the presence of their spouse and one of their older children," raises concerns about social desirability bias. Were participants assured of anonymity in responding?

Figure 1 (pre-modification model) and Figure 2 (post-modification model) show the removal of two items. However, the manuscript does not explicitly explain whether modification indices suggested these changes. Were these decisions theoretically or empirically driven?

The sentence, "All constructs had AVE values above 0.5, confirming convergent validity," should be expanded. The magnitude of AVE values should be compared to those found in prior studies of the Persian Ryff scale to assess consistency.

The Fornell-Larcker criterion is discussed, but the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio is also included. Since HTMT is a more robust measure, a sentence should be added explaining why it was used alongside Fornell-Larcker.

The GOF (Goodness of Fit) index is reported as 0.51, but other SEM model fit indices, such as SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual), are not mentioned. If SRMR was calculated, it should be reported for additional confirmation of model fit.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

