Reputation in the Digital Age: Strategies of Online Redemption after Peer-Exposed Mistakes

Badhon. Ahmmed[1] , Anahit. Hakobyan[2*]

[1] Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan
[2] Department of Psychology, Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia

* Corresponding author email address: a.hakobyan@ysu.am

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Ahmad Amani Associate Professor, Counseling Department, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran a.amani@uok.ac.ir	**Reviewer 1:** Mehdi Rostami Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca **Reviewer 2:** Mahdi Khanjani Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1.   Round 1

1.1.   Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The historical framing of offline vs. online reputation is strong, but it would benefit from explicitly linking to adolescent and youth psychological frameworks, since the journal audience is psychology-focused.

In "With participants' consent, all interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim", the description of ethical safeguards is limited. Please add information about anonymity guarantees, secure storage, and whether participants could withdraw data post-interview.

Researcher reflexivity: The section on data analysis states "Memo writing and reflexive notes were maintained…". This is excellent, but further elaboration on the researchers' positionality (e.g., insider/outsider status, cultural familiarity with Armenia) would add credibility.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion of Borţun (2014) and Šontaitė-Petkevičienė (2014) in the introduction emphasizes fragility of reputation, but the connection to individual psychological outcomes (e.g., anxiety, shame) is delayed until findings. Consider foregrounding these in the introduction for conceptual continuity.

Integration with literature: In the discussion section, the alignment with Li et al. (2019) is noted ("confirming Li et al.'s conclusion that apologies…shift user attitudes"). However, the paper could further connect this to apology typologies in crisis communication research for more theoretical sophistication.

Novel contribution: The statement "One of the most significant contributions of this study lies in the long-term lessons…" is promising. Yet, the discussion risks sounding descriptive rather than analytical. Please articulate how these findings advance theory in youth psychology or digital reputation research.

Cross-cultural generalizability: In "The strong influence of Armenian cultural norms…" under Limitations, the authors correctly note limited generalizability. However, this issue should also be flagged in the Discussion, not just Limitations, to avoid overstating findings' universality.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2.   Revised

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