

Article history: Received 13 April 2025 Revised 19 July 2025 Accepted 24 July 2025 Published online 10 August 2025

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

The Mediating Role of Body Image Flexibility in the Relationship Between Perfectionism and Self-Compassion With Instagram Selfie-Editing

Arman. Monavari Khiavi 10, Manijeh. Firoozi 2*0

* Corresponding author email address: mfiroozy@ut.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Trevor Archer	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar
Professor Department of Psychology University of Gothenburg Sweden trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	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: Ali Khodaei
	Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam
	Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The second paragraph in the Introduction states that "Perfectionism—especially in its maladaptive forms—is characterized by rigid standards and a chronic sense of inadequacy..." Consider citing a specific model (e.g., Frost's model or Hewitt & Flett) and distinguishing between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism more clearly.

In paragraph seven of the Introduction, where Iran's sociocultural background is discussed, the claim "patriarchal beauty norms and collective identity tensions..." needs empirical support. Reference sociological or psychological studies specific to Iran's digital culture.

In the "Measures" section, more detail is needed on the psychometric validation process of the researcher-developed Selfie-Editing Questionnaire. The current explanation is too brief. Specify how expert review was conducted, how many experts were consulted, and what criteria were used.

While the study uses self-report questionnaires, the limitations section (or methods) does not mention potential biases (e.g., social desirability bias), which is especially relevant given the stigmatized nature of selfie-editing.

¹ Master of General Psychology, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran



In the "Study Design and Participants" paragraph, clarify whether any stratification (e.g., by gender, field of study, or Instagram usage frequency) was considered to enhance the generalizability of the findings beyond the University of Tehran population.

The phrase in the "Data Analysis" section—"at a significance level of 0.05"—should be accompanied by a justification, especially for multiple comparisons or indirect effects via bootstrapping.

Table 5 indicates the removal of the "body editing" item due to a loading of 0.44. Please specify the minimum factor loading threshold used and justify why 0.44 was considered inadequate in this context.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the statement "Despite this, the exact mechanisms through which self-compassion influences visual self-presentation behavior remain underexplored..." would benefit from elaboration. Specify whether this refers to emotional, motivational, or behavioral mechanisms.

The manuscript would be strengthened by explicitly presenting a theoretical model or visual diagram early in the Introduction that illustrates the proposed mediational pathway (perfectionism/self-compassion \rightarrow body image flexibility \rightarrow selfie-editing).

In the results, the VIF value is stated as 1.004 and tolerance as 0.996. It would be helpful to clarify how these values relate to accepted multicollinearity thresholds and to explicitly state what these statistics indicate about the relationship between perfectionism and self-compassion.

The rationale for excluding gender from the final model due to nonsignificance (mentioned in both correlation table and discussion) would benefit from additional explanation. Was any interaction effect tested? Did this align with theoretical expectations?

The R² value (42%) for body image flexibility and selfie-editing is promising, but the manuscript does not interpret its magnitude. Consider including commentary on whether this effect size is considered small, medium, or large based on SEM conventions.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

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

