

Identifying Psychological Predictors of Cyberbullying Involvement in Adolescents Using Machine Learning

Petar. Ivanov^{1*} , Laura. Gómez² 

¹ Department of Developmental Psychology, Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

² Department of Cognitive Psychology, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

* Corresponding author email address: petar.ivanov@uni-sofia.bg

Editor

Ahmad Amani 

Associate Professor, Counseling
Department, University of
Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran
a.amani@uok.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Karim Afshariniya 

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Kermanshah, Iran Email: k.afsharineya@iauksh.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Keivan Kakabreae 

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: keivan@iauksh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the sentence “cyberbullying is not merely a digital extension of traditional bullying but a distinct psychosocial phenomenon”, the manuscript would benefit from a brief operational clarification of what makes cyberbullying ontologically distinct (e.g., permanence, audience size, algorithmic amplification), rather than relying solely on citations.

The paragraph citing Shiba & Mokwena (2023, 2024) discusses perpetrator–victims but does not clearly articulate how this study operationalizes these roles. Please add one sentence explicitly linking prior conceptualizations to the categorization strategy used in the present dataset.

Table 1 reports means for psychological variables but does not specify scale ranges. Please add the minimum and maximum possible scores to facilitate substantive interpretation of the reported means.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The manuscript states: “much of the literature relies on traditional statistical methods that assume linear relationships.”

Consider strengthening this claim by briefly citing specific limitations (e.g., interaction suppression, multicollinearity) and explaining why these are particularly problematic for adolescent psychological data.

The aim sentence is clear but could be strengthened by explicitly stating whether the study is exploratory or confirmatory in nature, especially given the use of multiple machine learning models.

The manuscript notes that instruments showed “acceptable internal consistency coefficients” but does not report Cronbach’s alpha (or McDonald’s omega) for the current sample. Please report sample-specific reliability indices for all key scales.

The phrase “widely used cyberbullying involvement questionnaire” is vague. Please specify the exact instrument name, number of items, response scale, and provide at least one citation supporting its validity.

While multiple algorithms are listed, the manuscript does not justify why these specific models were selected. Please add a short rationale linking each algorithm to the nature of the data (e.g., nonlinearity, interaction detection).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.