

The Effectiveness of Adolescent-Centered Mindfulness Training on Self-Compassion in Adolescent Boys with Psychological Insecurity

Alireza. Fattahi Dolatabadi^{1*}

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, DOL.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Ar.fatahi@iauda.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Muhammad Rizwan ^{id} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk	Reviewer 1: Stephen C. L. Lau ^{id} Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu Reviewer 2: Azade Abooei ^{id} Department of Counseling, Faculty of Humanities, University of Science and Art, Yazd, Iran. Email: a.abooei@tea.sau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Psychological insecurity is particularly salient in contemporary adolescent contexts characterized by rapid sociocultural change...” is well articulated, but the paragraph remains largely descriptive. Please consider adding one sentence clarifying why insecurity is theoretically expected to respond to mindfulness-based interventions, rather than other forms of psychosocial training.

In the paragraph beginning “Systematic reviews and experimental studies have documented...”, multiple outcomes of mindfulness are listed. For coherence, I suggest prioritizing self-compassion as the central mechanism and reducing discussion of distal outcomes (e.g., behavioral problems) that are not assessed in the current study.

The sentence “Unlike traditional mindfulness programs originally designed for adults...” introduces adolescent-centered mindfulness well. However, the manuscript would benefit from a concise definition or core components of “adolescent-centered mindfulness” early on, rather than assuming familiarity.

The paragraph beginning “Despite the growing body of literature, several gaps remain” is well structured. Nonetheless, the authors should explicitly state why adolescent boys with psychological insecurity constitute a theoretically distinct group, rather than relying solely on underrepresentation arguments.

In the paragraph stating “Using convenience sampling, sixty male students...”, please clarify how psychological insecurity was initially screened prior to questionnaire administration. Was a cutoff score applied before random assignment, and if so, how was it justified?

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph introducing self-compassion (“One construct consistently identified as a key protective factor...”), the authors appropriately cite Neff’s framework. However, the manuscript does not sufficiently distinguish self-compassion from adjacent constructs such as emotional acceptance or self-esteem. A brief comparative clarification would strengthen conceptual precision.

The paragraph starting “The relevance of self-compassion for adolescents facing psychological insecurity...” presents mediation evidence, yet the causal language could be interpreted too strongly. Please revise phrases implying causality unless directly supported by experimental or longitudinal designs.

The exclusion criterion “failure to complete assigned tasks” is vague. Please specify whether this refers to session attendance, homework compliance, or assessment completion, and indicate how many participants (if any) were excluded post-randomization.

In the paragraph describing the Zare’ and Aminpour questionnaire, the manuscript reports Cronbach’s alpha values from prior studies and the current study. Please clarify whether reliability was calculated separately for pretest, posttest, and follow-up, or aggregated across time points.

The sentence “After summing the scores of the 26 items, scores ranging from 26 to 44 indicate low self-compassion...” appears descriptive but is not subsequently used analytically. Please clarify whether categorical interpretation was applied or whether only continuous scores were analyzed.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.