

Article history: Received 14 March 2024 Revised 22 May 2024 Accepted 02 June 2024 Published online 10 June 2024

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Prediction of Mental Health and Self-Esteem Based on Perceived Social Support in Youth with Physical Disabilities in Tehran

Zeinab. Jalilbal¹, Maryam. Behnam Moradi^{2*}, Sima. Nazarpour³

M.A., Department of Psychology, Varamin-Pishva Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Varamin-Pishva Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
Associate Professor, Department of Midwifery, Varamin-Pishva Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m.behnammoradi@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Salahadin Lotfi®	Reviewer 1: Hooman Namvar [®]
PhD in Cognitive Psychology &	Assisstant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad
Neuroscience, UWM & Rogers	University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir
Behavioral Health Verified,	Reviewer 2: Elham Azarakhsh [©]
Lecturer at University of Wisconsin slotfi@uwm.edur	Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Qom Branch, Qom, Iran.
siotii@uwiii.edui	Email: elhamazarakhsh@qom.iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the "Methods and Materials" section, it states, "Of this population 400 were accessible samples... of which 250 were male and the rest were female." Clarify the exact number of female participants to avoid ambiguity.

Justify why the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support was chosen over other scales that measure similar constructs, particularly for your specific population.

The statement, "Since the skewness and kurtosis values are within the range (-2, 2) this indicates the normal distribution of the data," is useful. However, consider providing a reference or justification for using these specific cutoff values.

Provide a more detailed explanation of why multiple regression analysis was chosen for this study and discuss any assumptions checked before conducting the analysis.

Ensure that all tables have comprehensive legends. For example, Table 1 lacks a description of what each subscale measures and its implications.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.



1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The ethical considerations in the methodology are discussed, but it would be beneficial to mention if participants provided informed consent and how confidentiality was maintained.

The introduction cites various studies to support the background. However, it would be useful to include more recent sources, particularly studies published in the last five years, to ensure the literature review is current.

In the "Measures" section, it states, "Joushanlou Daemi and Bakhshi (2020) reported the reliability of this scale in their research using Cronbach's alpha coefficient as 0.89." Consider adding more details about the context of this study and its relevance to your population.

The correlation matrix presented in Table 2 shows significant relationships. Discuss the potential implications of these correlations in more detail, especially how they relate to your hypotheses.

In Table 3, you mention "Larger Beta and t values and smaller significance levels (Sig) indicate a stronger impact." Consider providing a brief interpretation of each coefficient in the text to help readers understand the practical significance.

In the discussion about the second hypothesis, provide more detail on why perceived social support might not predict self-esteem based on theoretical frameworks or previous research findings.

Address any contradictory findings more thoroughly. For example, your results on self-esteem differ from previous studies. Discuss possible reasons for these discrepancies in more depth.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

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

