

# Shame as a Mediator Between Body Dissatisfaction and Disordered Eating Attitudes

Samuel. Moreau<sup>1</sup>, Laura. Bennett<sup>2\*</sup>, Brian. Matthews<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Family Counseling, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

<sup>3</sup> Department of Health Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

\* Corresponding author email address: samuel.moreau@mcgill.ca

## Editor

Thseen Nazir<sup>id</sup>  
Professor of Psychology and  
Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun  
University, Istanbul, Turkey  
thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Sara Nejatifar <sup>id</sup>  
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of  
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.  
**Reviewer 2:** Mehdi Rostami <sup>id</sup>  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond  
Hill, Ontario, Canada.  
Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Shame may also mediate the link between sociocultural pressures and disordered eating...” introduces mediation without explaining the theoretical justification for shame as a mediator in this context. Adding references to mediation theory or emotion regulation models would strengthen this claim.

The sentence “Normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis values...” should report the actual values in a supplementary table or appendix to ensure transparency and replicability.

The phrase “Participants reported a relatively high mean level of body dissatisfaction...” is subjective. Consider defining what qualifies as “high” in relation to normative or clinical cutoffs from prior studies.

The correlation between body dissatisfaction and shame ( $r = .58$ ) is strong. Consider discussing the potential for multicollinearity in SEM beyond VIF, such as examining tolerance or shared variance.

The model fit indices are appropriately reported, but the article does not mention any model modifications (e.g., correlated residuals or error terms) that may have been applied to achieve these indices. This should be clarified.

The sentence “Shame... may compel individuals to attempt to ‘correct’ or hide perceived bodily flaws...” should reference theoretical models such as Gilbert’s shame-attack model or affect regulation theories for greater conceptual rigor.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion of Panero et al. (2022) and Vizin et al. (2022) lacks integration. A more explicit comparison of the nature of shame (trait vs. state) across these studies would enrich the theoretical argument.

The research objective is clearly stated, but it would be more rigorous to articulate a testable hypothesis grounded in the previous literature (e.g., “It is hypothesized that shame significantly mediates...”).

The paragraph refers to the BSQ-34 but does not indicate whether a validated French version was used for French-speaking Canadians, which could impact reliability.

It would be helpful to report the Cronbach’s alpha for the ESS in the current sample to verify internal consistency rather than relying solely on previous studies.

The inclusion of both direct and indirect paths is commendable. However, the method used to assess the significance of the mediation effect (e.g., bootstrapping) is not described and should be added.

The sentence “indicating that individuals who experience dissatisfaction with their bodies are more likely to develop disordered eating attitudes...” could benefit from a cautionary note about causality given the cross-sectional design.

While Kulshreshtha et al. (2020) and Ebrahim et al. (2019) are cited to show cross-cultural validity, a direct comparison with the current Canadian sample is lacking. Suggest incorporating a short reflection on cultural variability in shame expression.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.