

Development of a Parent–Adolescent Relationship Training Program Based on the Lived Experiences of Mothers of Children with Social Anxiety Disorder and Examination of Its Effectiveness on Adolescents’ Social Adjustment, Social Anxiety, and Emotion Regulation

Zohre. Tajabadi¹, Farangis. Kazemi^{2*}, Shahla. Pezeshk³, Mahdiyeh. Azizi⁴, Fahimeh. Dehghani⁵

¹ PhD Student, Department of Psychology, University of Science and Arts, Yazd, Iran

² Associate Professor of Exceptional Children Psychology, Department of Psychology, Science and Arts University, Yazd, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Science and Arts University, Yazd, Iran

⁴ PhD in Psychology. Faculty of Humanities, University of Science and Arts. Yazd. Iran

⁵ Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Farangis_kazemi@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Salahadin Lotfi ^{id} PhD in Cognitive Psychology & Neuroscience, UWM & Rogers Behavioral Health Verified, Lecturer at University of Wisconsin slotfi@uwm.edu	Reviewer 1: Zahra Yousefi ^{id} Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Kamdin. Parsakia ^{id} Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The literature review relies heavily on generalized statements without critically synthesizing prior findings. For instance, the paragraph beginning “Recent psychological interventions for adolescent social anxiety have increasingly emphasized cognitive-behavioral, emotion-focused, and skills-based approaches” summarizes interventions descriptively but does not evaluate their limitations or compare their relative efficacy. A more analytical review is needed to justify why a phenomenologically derived parent-focused program offers added value compared to existing evidence-based interventions.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are relatively comprehensive; however, the manuscript does not specify how comorbid psychiatric disorders were assessed. The sentence “diagnosis had been confirmed by a clinical psychologist based on DSM-5-

TR criteria” does not indicate whether structured clinical interviews such as SCID-5 or K-SADS were used. The absence of standardized diagnostic assessment procedures may compromise diagnostic validity and should be addressed.

The Measures section contains important psychometric limitations. The manuscript reports Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the instruments but does not provide evidence regarding construct validity, convergent validity, or factor structure in the present sample . Given the cultural and developmental specificity of the sample, the authors should report confirmatory factor analysis results or provide stronger evidence supporting the instruments’ applicability to Iranian adolescents with social anxiety disorder.

There is an inconsistency between the intervention structure reported in different sections. In the abstract, the intervention is described as “10 weekly sessions of 90 minutes” , whereas the Methods section repeatedly describes the intervention as “eight 90-minute sessions” . This discrepancy creates uncertainty regarding the actual intervention dosage and threatens reproducibility. The authors must reconcile all session-related inconsistencies throughout the manuscript.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The rationale for selecting only mothers in the qualitative phase is insufficiently justified. In the paragraph beginning “Another important issue in the literature concerns the role of mothers’ psychological experiences,” the manuscript assumes maternal experiences are uniquely influential without adequately discussing fathers’ roles or broader family-system influences . The authors should theoretically justify the exclusive focus on mothers and discuss whether exclusion of fathers may limit the ecological validity and generalizability of the findings.

The methodological description of the qualitative phase lacks important rigor indicators. In the paragraph beginning “The present study was applied in terms of purpose and employed an exploratory sequential mixed-methods design,” the authors mention using Colaizzi’s thematic analysis method but provide no explanation of procedures for ensuring trustworthiness, such as member checking, peer debriefing, audit trails, or intercoder agreement . Given the phenomenological design, explicit discussion of credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability is necessary.

The sampling strategy in the qualitative phase requires further clarification. The statement “interviews were conducted with 20 mothers until theoretical saturation was achieved” does not explain how saturation was operationalized or determined . The authors should specify whether code saturation, meaning saturation, or thematic saturation was used and describe the process through which saturation decisions were reached.

The quantitative sampling procedure also requires stronger justification. The manuscript states that “a sample of 30 participants was selected using convenience sampling and randomly assigned into two groups of 15 participants each” . Although a citation to Cohen’s rationale is provided, the manuscript does not report the expected effect size assumptions in sufficient detail nor explain whether attrition was anticipated. Given the complexity of repeated-measures designs, the adequacy of n=15 per group should be discussed more rigorously.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.