

The Relationship Between Schema Modes, Psychological Flexibility, and Alexithymia with Subjective Well-Being Among Students in Qazvin

Kiana. Naghash Souratgar¹, Majid. Mahmoud Alilou^{2*}, Touraj. Hashemi Nosratabad²

¹ Master of Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Tabriz Campus, Tabriz, Iran

² Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m-alilou@tabrizu.ac.ir

Editor

John S. Carlson
Distinguished Professor of the Department of Educational Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United States
carlsoj@msu.edu

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Seyed Ali Darbani
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the opening paragraph defines subjective well-being effectively; however, the statement “It is widely recognized as a key indicator of mental health...” would benefit from the inclusion of more recent meta-analytic or systematic review citations to strengthen its evidentiary basis, particularly given the reliance on a single citation (Mateen, 2025).

In the second paragraph of the Introduction, the authors state that schema modes “represent moment-to-moment emotional states and coping responses.” While theoretically accurate, this sentence would benefit from a more explicit differentiation between schema modes and early maladaptive schemas to avoid conceptual conflation, especially for readers less familiar with schema therapy frameworks.

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence “psychological flexibility refers to the ability to remain in contact with the present moment...” is well grounded in ACT theory; however, the authors should explicitly reference the six core processes of psychological flexibility (e.g., acceptance, cognitive defusion, self-as-context) to enhance theoretical rigor.

In the Psychological Flexibility Questionnaire description, the instruction that participants “identify an important personal goal” introduces variability in interpretation. The authors should discuss how this personalization may affect measurement standardization and comparability across participants.

In the Alexithymia section, the reported Cronbach’s alpha for the externally oriented thinking (EOT) subscale is 0.57, which is below acceptable thresholds. The authors should address this limitation explicitly and consider its implications for measurement reliability.

In the Data Analysis section, the sentence “assumptions such as normality and linearity were assessed” is too general. The authors should specify the statistical tests used (e.g., Kolmogorov–Smirnov, Shapiro–Wilk, scatterplots) to enhance transparency and replicability.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the fourth paragraph of the Introduction, the description of alexithymia is comprehensive; however, the sentence “Individuals with high levels of alexithymia often struggle to process emotional information effectively” would benefit from specifying whether this refers to deficits in emotional awareness, emotional labeling, or interoceptive processing, as these are distinct subcomponents in contemporary models.

In the fifth paragraph of the Introduction, the integrative argument is conceptually strong; however, the sentence “maladaptive schema modes may contribute to psychological inflexibility and alexithymic tendencies” is presented as a causal statement despite the correlational nature of the literature cited. The authors should rephrase this in probabilistic or associative terms.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the authors correctly identify research gaps; however, the sentence “most existing studies have examined these variables in isolation” would benefit from citing specific empirical studies that illustrate this limitation rather than making a generalized claim.

In the Methods section under “Study Design and Participants,” the sentence “which was deemed appropriate based on the number of variables under investigation” lacks methodological justification. The authors should explicitly reference a sampling rationale (e.g., power analysis, rule-of-thumb for regression models) to substantiate sample adequacy.

In the same section, the multistage cluster sampling procedure is described; however, the sentence “All students present in the selected classes were included as the final sample” raises concerns about potential selection bias due to absenteeism. The authors should discuss how this may affect representativeness.

In the “Measures” section, the description of the SWLS includes the statement “reliability coefficients reported around 0.85,” but it would be more precise to specify whether this refers to Cronbach’s alpha, test–retest reliability, or composite reliability.

In the PANAS description, the authors report “the overall reliability of the scale was 0.76, with coefficients of 0.89 for positive affect and 0.86 for negative affect.” This discrepancy should be clarified, as the overall reliability being lower than subscale reliabilities may indicate computational or reporting inconsistency.

In the Schema Mode Questionnaire section, the sentence “validity around 0.87” is vague and methodologically imprecise. The authors should specify the type of validity (construct, convergent, criterion) and the statistical index used.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.