

Predicting Cyberbullying Victimization Experiences Based on Family Communication Patterns and Inner Self-Talk in Adolescents

Seyedeh Maryam. Mousavi¹, Shoukofeh. Naderlou², Farnaz. Nasiri^{3*}

¹ Master of Science in General Psychology, Department of Psychology, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

² Master of Family Counseling, Counseling Department, Mohaghegh Ardabili University, Ardabil, Iran

³ Department of Educational Psychology, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: naserifarnaz382@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Muhammad Rizwan ^{ORCID} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar ^{ORCID} 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 ^{ORCID} Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuif.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The discussion of self-talk beginning at L112 refers to “constructive self-talk” as protective. Consider clarifying operational definitions and differentiating between subtypes of self-talk (e.g., motivational vs. evaluative) to improve theoretical specificity.

In paragraph L185, the manuscript highlights family communication patterns as determinants of adolescent psychosocial adjustment. The authors should discuss potential cultural differences in family communication and how these may affect generalizability beyond the Iranian context.

The description of the sample at L408–L417 notes equal gender representation. The authors might include more details on socioeconomic status or school type distribution to allow a better understanding of sample diversity and potential confounding factors.

The discussion paragraph starting at L510 highlights the negative relationship between inner self-talk and victimization. It would strengthen the argument to discuss potential mechanisms linking specific subscales (social assessment, self-management) to coping strategies.

In paragraph L596–L609, conversation orientation is linked to lower victimization. The authors should consider whether bidirectional influences might exist (e.g., adolescents who experience less victimization might perceive family communication more positively).

The description of conformity orientation at L636–L651 suggests increased victimization risk. Including a brief discussion on how conformity orientation interacts with peer norms or online anonymity could enrich interpretation.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the methods section, the sampling method is described as convenience sampling (L294). The manuscript should acknowledge the limitations of this approach in reducing selection bias and its implications for external validity more explicitly.

The measurement description of the CBVEQ at L313–L334 is thorough, but the manuscript could benefit from a brief discussion of potential cultural adaptation or translation validation, given that the instrument was originally developed in a different context.

In the description of the Family Communication Patterns Questionnaire (L335–L359), the authors report high test-retest reliability. It would be helpful to provide evidence or references confirming validity and reliability in Iranian adolescent samples specifically.

Regarding the Inner Self-Talk Scale (L366–L387), the description includes multiple versions of the instrument. The manuscript should clarify exactly which version was used, including item modifications, to ensure reproducibility.

In the data analysis section (L388–L406), the authors report using Pearson correlations and multiple regression. They should provide justification for the assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity checks, particularly given multiple predictors.

In the results (L408–L440), Table 1 presents descriptive statistics but does not include skewness or kurtosis values. Including these would help readers assess the appropriateness of parametric analyses.

The Pearson correlation table (L448–L456) shows significant associations, but the manuscript should discuss potential shared method variance since all variables were self-reported, potentially inflating correlations.

The multiple regression results (L477–L505) show $R^2 = 0.315$. The discussion could contextualize this effect size in relation to prior research, indicating whether this proportion of variance is meaningful in applied terms.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.