KMAN PUBLISHING INSTITUTE
Journal Website

Article history:
Received 12 January 2026
Revised 20 March 2026
Accepted 23 March 2026
Published online 01 April 2026

Journal of Personality and Psychosomatic Research

Open Peer-Review Report

E-ISSN: 3041-8542

Modeling the Contribution of Cognitive Fusion, Rumination, and Worry to Psychosomatic Distress: An Explainable Machine Learning Study

Ardit. Hoxha[1], Yasmine. Ben Salah[2*], Nouhayla. Hafidi[3]

[1] Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Tirana, Tirana, Albania
[2] Department of Social Psychology, University of Tunis, Tunis, Tunisia
[3] High Institute of Human Sciences, Tunis Al Manar University, Tunis, Tunisia

*** Corresponding author email address**: yasmine.bensalah@utunis.tn

Editor	Reviewers
Bahram Jowkar Professor of Psychology Department, Shiraz University, Iran jowkar@shirazu.ac.ir	**Reviewer 1:** Amer M. Eissa The American University in Cairo, New Cairo, Egypt. Email: amer_eissa@aucegypt.edu **Reviewer 2:** Paul Peters-Boselie Clinical Psychology, Open University, 6401 DL, Heerlen, Netherlands. paul.peters-boselie@ou.nl

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The research questions and/or hypotheses are not presented with optimal clarity and logical progression. Some appear implied rather than explicitly formulated, and the links from theory to hypotheses are not always fully justified. I suggest enumerating all research questions/hypotheses clearly (e.g., H1a, H1b, etc.), ensuring that each one follows directly from the theoretical arguments provided. For each hypothesis, explicitly state the underlying mechanism or rationale (why you expect that relationship) and connect it to specific citations, rather than relying on general or intuitive reasoning.

The methodology section would benefit from richer detail to enable replication and to allow readers to assess the rigor of the design. Key elements such as sampling strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, data collection procedures, and potential sources of bias are not always fully described. Please provide: (a) a clear description of the population and sampling frame; (b) justification for the sample size (e.g., power analysis or reference to similar studies); © any steps taken to mitigate common method bias or measurement error; and (d) ethical considerations (e.g., approval, consent). This level of transparency is now a standard expectation in high-quality journals.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The measurement of key constructs needs more comprehensive reporting. It is not always clear whether the scales are adapted or newly developed, how items were selected, and whether they were pre-tested. For each construct, please report: the source of the scale, the number of items, sample items, reliability indices (e.g., Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability), and validity evidence (e.g., factor loadings, AVE, discriminant validity criteria). If translation/back-translation was used (for non-English instruments), briefly describe that process. Providing a summary table of constructs and items (possibly in an appendix) would greatly enhance clarity.

The data analysis section, although containing relevant results, should more clearly distinguish between preliminary analyses, main hypothesis testing, and robustness or sensitivity checks. At present, the analytical steps feel somewhat fused and may be difficult for readers to follow. I recommend structuring this section as follows: (a) descriptive statistics and correlations; (b) reliability and validity tests; © main model estimation and hypothesis testing; and (d) any robustness checks or alternative specifications. For each step, briefly justify the chosen analytical techniques (e.g., why a particular regression model, SEM, or other method is appropriate).

The interpretation of results occasionally goes beyond what the data can firmly support, and causal language is sometimes used where the design appears correlational or observational. Please temper any strong causal claims unless your design genuinely supports causal inference (e.g., experiment, strong quasi-experimental design). When discussing your findings, clearly distinguish between empirical results ("we found that…") and your theoretical interpretation ("this may suggest that…"). Additionally, where findings diverge from expectations or prior studies, offer more in-depth, theoretically grounded explanations rather than brief or speculative comments.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

JPPR
E-ISSN: 3041-8542