

## **Effectiveness of Dialectical Behavior Therapy on Feelings of Rejection and Inferiority in Bereaved Adolescent Girls**

Azam. Shahbazi<sup>1</sup>, Navid. NasrEsfahani<sup>1</sup>, Zahra. Yousefi<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, Research Center for Behavioral and Psychological science, Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: [Dr\\_yousefi@iau.ac.ir](mailto:Dr_yousefi@iau.ac.ir)

---

### Editor

Muhammad Rizwan

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan  
[muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk](mailto:muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk)

### 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](mailto:s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir)

**Reviewer 2:** Kamdin. Parsakia 

Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: [kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca](mailto:kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca)

---

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The final paragraphs note that the sample consists of bereaved adolescent girls, yet the introduction only briefly mentions that girls may be “uniquely vulnerable.” Please justify this sample choice with clearer developmental, social, or psychological reasoning.

In the methods section, the authors describe screening 300 students and selecting 40 with “above-average scores” on a bereavement questionnaire. It is unclear what benchmarks define “above-average.” Consider explaining how the cutoff was determined and whether it reflects normative or sample-based averages.

In the intervention section, Session 1 includes “review of maladaptive self-harm coping strategies.” It is not clear whether participants had a documented history of self-harm. Including content not directly relevant to the sample may raise questions about treatment tailoring. Justify the inclusion or modify the description.

The manuscript provides no information about treatment fidelity. It would be beneficial to add whether sessions were supervised, whether a treatment manual was strictly followed, and whether any fidelity checks were implemented.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

In paragraph 2, the authors describe bereavement as “a developmental derailment that interferes with identity formation, emotion regulation, and interpersonal functioning.” The term “derailment” is impactful but requires elaboration. The manuscript should clarify what mechanisms link bereavement in adolescence to these disrupted domains.

Paragraph 3 states: “One of the most consequential psychosocial outcomes in bereaved adolescents is perceived rejection.” While compelling, the argument jumps quickly to this claim. The authors should provide a clearer explanation of why bereavement may specifically heighten rejection sensitivity rather than other interpersonal vulnerabilities.

In paragraph 4, the authors introduce inferiority as “chronic self-doubt, social comparison, and a sense of inadequacy.” This is accurate, but the link between bereavement and inferiority is underdeveloped. The manuscript would benefit from a deeper explanation of how grief experiences contribute to internalized self-devaluation.

The Bereavement Experience Questionnaire is researcher-developed. While the manuscript notes CVR and CVI, it does not explain the theoretical basis for item creation or whether pilot testing was conducted. Providing this information will strengthen confidence in the screening tool.

The manuscript describes the reliability of the Perceived Rejection Scale and Inferiority Feeling Questionnaire based on previous research but does not report reliability coefficients for the current sample. Reliability should be reported using the present study’s data.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.