

Article history:
Received 14 June 2025
Revised 25 October 2025
Accepted 01 November 2025
Published 10 November 2025

Examining the Mediating Role of Mindfulness in the Relationship Between Components of Resilience and Self-Efficacy with Psychological Well-Being and Emotion Regulation




Raheleh. Joharian¹, Masoumeh. Behboodi^{2*}, Simindokht. Rezakhani³

¹ Ph.D Student, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Mabeboodi@gmail.com

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: 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: Kamdin. Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While resilience is described as a “dynamic process,” the manuscript does not clarify which conceptualization of resilience (trait-based vs. process-based) underpins the proposed structural model. This distinction should be explicitly stated to strengthen theoretical coherence.

The statement “self-efficacy is increasingly viewed as a foundational mechanism” would benefit from a brief explanation of how self-efficacy is theoretically differentiated from resilience in the present model, given their conceptual overlap in coping and adaptation.

The exclusion of individuals with “other psychiatric disorders” is noted, but the manuscript does not specify how psychiatric comorbidities were assessed (self-report vs. clinical diagnosis). This should be clarified.

The subscale structure described deviates slightly from the original Ryff model (e.g., “happiness and optimism”). Please justify any cultural adaptation or re-labeling of subscales.

The manuscript reports an overall emotion regulation score, yet CERQ is inherently multidimensional. Please justify the use of a total score and discuss potential implications for interpretation.

While assumptions are listed, the manuscript does not report diagnostic results (e.g., normality indices, multicollinearity statistics). Including a brief summary of assumption checks would strengthen methodological rigor.

The interpretation of mean scores as “moderate to high” would benefit from explicit reference points or cut-off criteria, rather than qualitative judgment alone.

Given the high correlation between mindfulness and psychological well-being ($r = .754$), the authors should comment on potential multicollinearity concerns in the structural model.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The manuscript discusses emotion regulation broadly but does not specify whether adaptive and maladaptive strategies are modeled separately or jointly. Clarifying this point here would help align the introduction with the operationalization used later in the CERQ.

The definition of mindfulness is accurate; however, the authors should clarify why MAAS (a unidimensional attentional measure) was chosen instead of multidimensional mindfulness instruments, given the mediational role attributed to mindfulness.

In the sentence “mindfulness may serve as a pathway through which resilience exerts its positive effects”, the causal language appears strong for a cross-sectional design. Consider rephrasing to reflect associational or explanatory mediation rather than causal mediation.

The identified gaps are relevant, but the authors should more explicitly articulate what is novel about testing both psychological well-being and emotion regulation simultaneously beyond stating that it is “limited” in prior research.

The description of the study as both “descriptive” and using SEM may appear conceptually inconsistent. Please clarify how the authors reconcile descriptive correlational design with theory-driven structural modeling.

The manuscript reports selecting 240 participants and later analyzing 152 cases. A clearer explanation is required regarding attrition, exclusion criteria application, and missing data handling to ensure transparency.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.