




Predicting Self-Worth from Attachment Security and Social Feedback Sensitivity




Dimitra. Kalogeropoulos¹, Eleni. Papadopoulos^{2*}, Nikos Antoniou³

¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Crete, Rethymno, Greece

² Department of Health Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

³ Department of Clinical Psychology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece

* Corresponding author email address: epapadopoulos@psych.uoa.gr

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Shokouh Navabinejad  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada sh.navabinejad@kmanresce.ca	Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran. Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Stephen C. L. Lau  Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The phrase “plays a foundational role in shaping individuals’ emotional well-being...” should be supported with an empirical reference to avoid unsubstantiated generalizations at the beginning of the paper.

The sentence “Given this background, the current study aims...” would be strengthened by specifying the study's hypotheses more explicitly, beyond stating general aims.

The paragraph lacks detail about how stratified sampling was operationalized. What strata were used (e.g., university, gender, academic major)? This information is crucial for assessing the representativeness of the sample.

The sentence “Statistical significance was determined at the 0.05 level...” is standard, but consider also mentioning whether confidence intervals were calculated, as this would add rigor.

The statement “These results reflect a generally well-adjusted university population” is interpretive and might be better placed in the discussion. It could also be misleading without normative comparisons.

The correlation table reports all relationships but omits effect size interpretation. A brief discussion of the strength of these correlations (e.g., moderate, strong) would be informative.

The sentence “The adjusted R^2 value of .46 further supports the stability...” should be rephrased. Adjusted R^2 reflects model fit accounting for the number of predictors, not “stability.” Consider using “generalizability” or “model adequacy” instead.

The explanation “each unit increase in attachment security increases self-worth by 0.11 units...” assumes readers understand the scale ranges. Consider providing context for what constitutes a “unit” in these measures to clarify real-world relevance.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Longitudinal evidence supports the notion that attachment security in adolescence can predict changes in self-esteem...” would benefit from specifying the time interval between measurements to highlight the longitudinal nature of the research cited.

The statement “Romantic partners can reinforce secure attachment and mitigate the negative influence of early familial dysfunction...” could benefit from clarifying the mechanisms through which romantic relationships exert these effects.

In the sentence “Anxious attachment can activate implicit self-doubt...” consider integrating more explanation or empirical backing for the term “implicit self-doubt,” which may not be familiar to all readers.

The claim “There are no subscales in this measure...” is accurate, but you might also briefly explain why this unidimensionality is beneficial or relevant for this study’s purpose.

Attachment Security: Since the ECR-R has two subscales (anxiety and avoidance), it would be helpful to explain how a composite attachment security score was derived and whether the two dimensions were analyzed separately before aggregation.

Social Feedback Sensitivity: The SSFS is said to have positive and negative subscales, but the analysis does not differentiate them. Consider justifying this decision or reporting separate correlations for each subscale.

The authors state, “participants with greater reactivity to social feedback...tended to report lower levels of self-worth.” This is a key finding and should be linked to practical implications, such as interventions for hypersensitivity.

The discussion on cultural context (e.g., “Mediterranean socio-cultural framework...”) is intriguing but lacks direct empirical evidence. Consider citing cultural studies or surveys supporting the relevance of collectivist values in Greek populations.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.