

# Prediction of Suicide Based on Executive Functions with the Mediating Role of Depression Symptoms


Ameneh. Bolori<sup>1</sup>, Ali. Farhadian<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master's Student, Department of Psychology, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: afarhadian@cfu.ac.ir

## Editor

Trevor Archer  
Professor Department of  
Psychology University of  
Gothenburg, Sweden  
trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Faranak Saboonchi  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran,  
Iran. Email: faranaksaboonchi@pnu.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Maasuomeh Behboodi  
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Roudehen, Iran. Email: masomehbehbodi@riau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The abstract should briefly mention the key statistical findings (e.g.,  $\beta$  values,  $R^2$ ) to reinforce the conclusion. Including numerical results will increase transparency and scientific rigor.

There is inconsistency between “convenience sampling” mentioned in the abstract and “stratified random sampling” described here. Please clarify the actual sampling method used.

The phrase is contradictory because it states the population is 300, yet the Morgan table sample size is 387. This needs correction or clarification to avoid confusion about the population and sampling logic.

The original developers of this scale are listed as Holst and Troll, but these names do not match the commonly cited versions of executive function tools. Please verify the citation and scale origin.

It is unclear whether this reliability data pertains to the current sample or is cited from another study. Indicate whether reliability was assessed again for this study.

While descriptive analysis is noted, no actual charts are provided in the paper. Either include these visualizations or remove the mention of charts.

You mention that the suicide variable distribution is not normal, but proceed with parametric analyses. Explain how the violation of normality was addressed (e.g., transformations, robustness checks).

The table presents Pearson correlations, yet the assumption of normality is violated for at least one variable. Please justify the use of Pearson's  $r$  or consider using Spearman's  $\rho$ .

You introduce structural equation modeling concepts, but do not mention the software used for PLS analysis. Was SmartPLS, WarpPLS, or another package used? This should be clarified.

The path coefficient for this relationship ( $\beta = 0.139$ ) is relatively weak. Discuss whether this relationship is of practical significance, despite being statistically significant.

This extensive citation list lacks critical engagement. Consider selecting a few key studies and explaining in detail how your findings support or contrast with them.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This opening lacks a strong justification for the focus on adolescents in Tehran. Please include epidemiological data or local mental health trends to contextualize the study's importance in this demographic.

The reference to "cognitive rigidity" is mentioned, but it would be more precise to link this term explicitly with the subdomains of executive function being measured (e.g., inhibition, memory). Clarification needed.

Although the Miyake model is cited, the paper omits its reference in APA style. Please include the full citation and explain how your study maps onto this model.

This sentence introduces "cold and hot executive functions" without defining them. A brief explanation is necessary for readers unfamiliar with this distinction.

The description of  $Q^2$  is thorough but lacks numerical breakdown of SSO and SSE. Please include the raw values or elaborate on how the  $Q^2$  value was calculated.

Although RMS Theta is reported (0.11), no interpretation is given for this value. Please elaborate on what this implies about model fit and why this threshold is appropriate.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.