






Tendency Toward Risky Behaviors Based on Differentiation of Self, Cognitive Flexibility, and Perceived Social Support in Adolescent Girls with a History of Running Away from Home

Zahra. Fadaeimoghadam¹, Mehri. Saadat², Souraya. Abbasgholipoor³, Amin Allah. Gholami⁴, Forud. Gholami^{*5}

¹ Master of Science in General Psychology, Qo.C., Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

² Master of Science in Rehabilitation Counseling, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran


³ Master of Family Counseling, Hormozgan University, Hormozgan, Iran

⁴ Master of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ahv.C., Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran



⁵ MA in women studies, Department of Social Sciences, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: forud.gholami@litr.iu.ac.ir

Editor

Anela Hasanagic
Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mohammad Salehi
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “Cognitive flexibility also moderates the impact of early trauma and stress...” is significant. However, it would enhance clarity if the authors specify how this moderation occurs, possibly citing a mediating cognitive mechanism (e.g., reframing, attentional shifting).

The statement “visual inspection of residual plots” is too general. The authors should specify which plots were used (e.g., Q-Q plots, residuals vs. fitted) and what patterns confirmed homoscedasticity.

While all correlations are significant, the authors should comment on the potential for overlapping variance among predictors (e.g., shared variance between DoS and perceived support), which may influence regression outcomes.

The adjusted $R^2 = .36$ is robust. However, the discussion could benefit from elaboration on the 63% of unexplained variance and whether additional psychological (e.g., trauma exposure) or environmental variables (e.g., socioeconomic status) might account for it.

The cultural analysis in Iranian collectivist contexts is compelling. However, it could be enriched by referencing a culturally grounded theoretical model (e.g., Hofstede's dimensions, triandis's collectivism/individualism) to ground this interpretation.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion of social support is strong, but the claim “perceived social support can play a transformative role...” would be more convincing with an example or quote from a qualitative study highlighting this perceived transformation.

While the rationale is clear, the justification for including these three constructs in one model could be enhanced by explaining how their interaction (rather than individual effects) offers new insights into risky behavior development.

The description of the CFI would be strengthened by clarifying whether the subscales were analyzed independently or combined into a total score during data analysis.

The finding that perceived social support ($\beta = -.33$) outperforms cognitive flexibility ($\beta = -.26$) is notable. The discussion should explore theoretical reasons for this difference and its implications for interventions.

The authors cite that “reduced self-differentiation is associated with...maladaptive coping.” A more specific example from their data (e.g., common types of risky behaviors observed) would help concretize this connection.

The sentence “This may be due to its integrative nature...” is speculative. The authors should either cite supporting evidence or rephrase it as a hypothesis for future study.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.