


Predicting Cyberbullying–Cybervictimization Experience Based on Parent–Child Relationship, Psychological Well-Being, and Internet Addiction in Adolescents in Isfahan City

Zahra. Gharagozloo¹, Tayebeh. Taheri Jebeli¹, Solmaz. Dabiri¹, Somayeh. Ashrafiard*¹



¹ Department of Educational Psychology and Personality Psychology, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: s.ashrafiard@iau.ir

Editor

Gholamreza Rajabi¹
Professor of Counseling
Department, Shahid Chamran
University, Ahvaz, Iran
rajabireza@scu.ac.ir

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
Reviewer 2: Zahra Yousefi 
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Isfahan, Iran.
Email: yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction's opening paragraph, the sentence "Contemporary developmental psychology views adolescence not merely as a transitional phase but as a period in which brain–behavior systems become increasingly responsive to social evaluation, peer belonging, autonomy, and identity formation" is strong but remains too general. The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit theoretical bridge between adolescent developmental sensitivity and cyberbullying–cybervictimization. For example, the authors should explain how heightened peer salience, reward sensitivity, identity experimentation, and emotional reactivity specifically increase adolescents' vulnerability to online aggression, retaliation, and victimization.

In the "Study Design and Participants" paragraph, there is a serious location inconsistency: the study is repeatedly described as being conducted among adolescents in Isfahan City, but the sampling procedure states, "Initially, six educational districts of Tehran City were considered as the main clusters." This must be corrected. If the study was conducted in Isfahan, "Tehran City" is an error and should be replaced with Isfahan. If the sampling was actually conducted in Tehran, then the title, abstract, population description, demographic reporting, and conclusion must all be revised accordingly.

In the same “Study Design and Participants” paragraph, the manuscript states that the statistical population included approximately “74,635 students,” but no source is provided for this population estimate. The authors should identify the source of this number, such as the Isfahan Department of Education, official enrollment statistics, or school district records. Because Morgan’s table is used to justify the sample size, the credibility of the population estimate is important. The manuscript should also report whether the sample size accounts for cluster sampling design effects, nonresponse, and incomplete questionnaires.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph of the introduction, where cyberbullying and cybervictimization are defined, the authors state that “adolescents may be perpetrators, victims, or bully-victims.” This is an important conceptual point, but the manuscript later treats cyberbullying–cybervictimization mainly as a combined total score. The authors should justify why they combine perpetration and victimization into one criterion variable despite acknowledging that these are distinct roles. If the theoretical claim is that cyberbullying and cybervictimization overlap, this should be supported analytically, for example by reporting the correlation between the two subscales and explaining why a composite score is defensible.

In the introduction paragraph beginning “Psychological well-being represents one of the central protective constructs,” the authors describe Ryff’s six dimensions, but the discussion later interprets psychological well-being mostly in terms of emotional regulation and resilience. The manuscript should better align the construct definition with the interpretation of findings. Specifically, the authors should explain how each Ryff dimension—autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relations, purpose in life, personal growth, and self-acceptance—may theoretically reduce cyberbullying or cybervictimization risk, rather than treating psychological well-being as a general protective factor.

In the introduction paragraph on internet addiction, the manuscript appropriately cites the I-PACE model and the compensatory internet use framework, but the integration remains underdeveloped. The sentence “Internet addiction may increase cyberbullying–cybervictimization risk through several mechanisms” should be expanded into a clearer causal pathway. The authors should specify whether excessive internet use increases risk mainly through exposure time, impulsivity, reduced executive control, anonymity, peer conflict, emotional dysregulation, or compensatory online engagement. This would strengthen the theoretical rationale for including internet addiction as a predictor rather than simply as another correlate.

In the family-context section of the introduction, the manuscript states that “parent–child relationship includes emotional closeness, conflict, dependency, communication, monitoring, warmth, and perceived support.” However, the measure used in the study appears to assess only closeness, conflict, and dependency. The authors should narrow the conceptual definition to match the actual measurement model or explicitly acknowledge that broader family variables such as monitoring, communication, and parental warmth were not directly measured. Otherwise, the literature review risks overextending the construct beyond the empirical indicators used in the study.

In the final paragraph of the introduction, the authors state that “fewer studies have simultaneously examined parent–child relationship, psychological well-being, and internet addiction as predictors of cyberbullying–cybervictimization in adolescents.” This is a suitable gap statement, but it should be made more precise. The authors should clarify whether the novelty lies in the Iranian context, the Isfahan adolescent population, the simultaneous regression model, the inclusion of parent–child relationship components, or the combined cyberbullying–cybervictimization outcome. A sharper gap statement would make the study’s contribution clearer and more defensible.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.