

Article history: Received 10 December 2023 Revised 11 January 2024 Accepted 19 February 2024 Published online 10 March 2024

# Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

## Development of a Causal Model of Perception of the COVID-19 Pandemic Based on Psychological Distress, Emotional Processing, and Self-Control with the Mediation of Psychological Well-Being in Young Adults

Saeeda. Babapouraghdam<sup>1</sup>, Jalil. Babapour Khairuddin<sup>2, 3</sup>, Marziyeh. Alivandi Vafa<sup>3</sup>

PhD Student, Department of Psychology, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tabriz University, East Azarbaijan, Iran
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Babapouri@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Seyed Ali Darbani	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Assistant Professor, Department of	Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences
Psychology and Counseling, South	and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir
Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad	Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami <sup>®</sup>
University, Tehran, Iran	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript is generally well-organized and clear. Minor revisions could enhance the flow between sections, particularly between the introduction and methods, ensuring a smoother transition that guides the reader through the research rationale.

The review is comprehensive; however, integrating recent studies could enrich the context, especially considering the evolving nature of COVID-19 research.

The sampling method and instruments are well-justified. Minor adjustments in explaining the selection criteria for the sample and a more detailed discussion on the implications of using convenience sampling would be beneficial.

The statistical analysis is robust. Including additional analyses, such as mediation analysis specifics, could clarify the mediation role of psychological well-being more distinctly.

The discussion aptly connects findings with existing literature. Enhancing this section with more specific suggestions for practical applications of the findings in psychological interventions would be valuable.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

#### 1.2. Reviewer 2

#### Reviewer:

While the study's aim is clear, refining the research questions to address more specific aspects of the causal relationships or including additional variables could enhance the novelty and depth of the research.

The review covers relevant literature but lacks critical analysis of how the current study expands or diverges from existing findings. A more thorough examination of conflicting studies and gaps in the literature would strengthen the justification for this research.

The reliance on convenience sampling raises questions about the generalizability of the findings. Consideration of alternative sampling strategies or a more detailed discussion on the limitations and implications of the chosen method is needed. Moreover, expanding on the psychometric properties of the instruments in the context of this study would enhance credibility.

While the statistical methods are appropriate, a deeper exploration of the data, such as examining potential moderators or conducting sensitivity analyses, could provide richer insights into the complex relationships being studied.

The implications for practice and policy are briefly touched upon but require expansion. A more thorough discussion of how these findings contribute to our understanding of young adults' psychological resilience during pandemics is necessary. Additionally, acknowledging and addressing the limitations more comprehensively, including potential biases and the cross-sectional nature of the study, would contextualize the findings more effectively.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

#### 2. Revised

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

