

Predicting Post-Traumatic Growth from Social Support and Meaning-Making Ability




Sophia. Lee¹, Brian. Matthews^{2*}, Jennifer. Torres³

¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, Stanford University, Stanford, USA

² Department of Health Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

³ Department of Educational Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, USA

* Corresponding author email address: bmatthews@umich.edu

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Chiedu Eseadi  Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria chiedu.esyadi@unn.edu.ng	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani  Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkonesh  Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the authors state, “PTG encompasses improved interpersonal relationships, increased personal strength...” without referencing the original PTGI theoretical framework by Tedeschi and Calhoun (1996). Including the original source here would strengthen conceptual grounding.

In the Introduction, the paragraph ending with “...including those recovering from medical trauma, natural disasters, violence, and bereavement (Azeem & Rauf, 2022; Tian & Wang, 2023...)” should clarify the types of trauma considered in the present study to align with the populations discussed.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the authors state, “...it becomes imperative to explore their predictive relationships using empirical models...” — it would improve clarity to explicitly state that the current study uses multiple regression to examine comparative predictive strength.

In Methods and Materials, the recruitment method “convenience sampling from online platforms and mental health community forums” needs a limitation note on potential self-selection bias and its effect on generalizability.

In the Findings section, the sentence “Participants reported a moderate to high level of post-traumatic growth...” would benefit from explicitly comparing these mean scores to published norms or thresholds, if available, to enhance interpretability.

In Table 2 and accompanying text, the strength of the correlations is not categorized (e.g., moderate, strong). Adding qualitative interpretation (e.g., “moderate correlation”) would aid the reader in contextualizing results.

In Table 3, the ANOVA table lacks an effect size indicator such as Cohen’s f^2 or partial eta squared, which would provide a more comprehensive picture of the model’s predictive power.

In Table 4, the regression coefficients are informative, but confidence intervals for B values should be reported to meet APA statistical reporting standards and aid in evaluating precision.

In the Discussion, the sentence “These results underscore the importance of both interpersonal and cognitive resources...” should acknowledge that causality cannot be inferred from the cross-sectional design.

In the Limitations section, the authors state “the study did not control for the type or severity of trauma,” yet such variables are crucial moderators in PTG research and should be discussed more critically.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the sentence, “Social support has emerged as a central predictor of PTG in numerous empirical studies,” the authors could enhance specificity by delineating whether this refers to perceived, received, or enacted support, as this distinction is critical in PTG literature.

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the discussion of mediation (e.g., “social support also serves as a mediator...”) would benefit from a clearer explanation that mediation was not assessed in this study, to avoid confusion with the current model.

In the paragraph discussing meaning-making, the sentence “The process of making meaning out of adversity has been associated with higher levels of PTG...” would benefit from clarification of whether this refers to global or situational meaning-making, as conceptualized in Park’s model.

In the Participants section, while trauma types are listed, the authors should clarify how trauma exposure was verified (e.g., self-report checklist, clinical interview, screening tool), which is essential for methodological rigor.

In the Measures section under “Post-Traumatic Growth,” while the psychometric properties of the PTGI are well-documented, the study should report Cronbach’s alpha for the present sample to confirm reliability in this context.

Under “Social Support,” the description of the MSPSS omits cultural validity considerations. Given the U.S. sample’s likely diversity, discussing how the MSPSS performs across ethnic groups would be useful.

In the Data Analysis section, the authors note “statistical assumptions related to normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity were assessed,” yet the methods used (e.g., VIF thresholds, residual analysis) are not fully described and should be elaborated for transparency.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.