

Predictive Modeling of Health Anxiety From Personality Dimensions and Physiological Stress Parameters

Ayako. Nishimura¹, Yu-Chen. Lin^{2*}

¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

² Department of Educational Psychology, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan

* Corresponding author email address: yclin@ntnu.edu.tw

Editor

Jordy Tasserie
Center for Brain Circuit
Therapeutics Department of
Neurology Brigham & Women's
Hospital, Harvard Medical School,
Boston, MA, USA
jtasserie@bwh.harvard.edu

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Marlon Elías Lobos Rivera
Universidad Tecnológica de El Salvador, El Salvador.Email:
marlon.lobos28@gmail.com
Reviewer 2: Sumaira Ayub
Department of Applied Psychology, University of Management and Technology,
Lahore, Pakistan.sumaira.ayub@umt.edu.pk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The literature review demonstrates familiarity with the core body of work, but it currently reads more as a list of studies than as a critical, synthetic narrative. It would be beneficial to reorganize this section thematically, compare and contrast key findings, and highlight theoretical tensions or inconsistencies that motivate your study. Adding a conceptual framework figure or a table summarizing prior studies (methods, samples, main findings) could significantly enhance clarity and justify the study's design.

The treatment of limitations is currently too brief and somewhat defensive. A more candid and analytical discussion of the study's constraints (e.g., sample representativeness, measurement limitations, cross-sectional vs. longitudinal design, potential confounding, and generalizability) would increase the credibility of the work. Importantly, these limitations should be coupled with concrete recommendations for future research, detailing how subsequent studies might address these issues or test your findings in different contexts or populations.

The implications for practice and/or policy are currently stated in relatively general terms and would be more persuasive if they were grounded directly in the specific empirical results. I suggest explicitly linking each practical implication to particular

findings, making clear the boundary conditions under which these implications hold. Where appropriate, you might distinguish between short-term actionable recommendations and longer-term structural or institutional changes that your results suggest.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The theoretical grounding of the article appears underdeveloped relative to its empirical ambitions. While relevant theories are mentioned, their mechanisms, assumptions, and testable implications are not clearly connected to your variables or design. I suggest elaborating a more explicit theoretical model that explains why you expect certain relationships, mediations, or moderations, and then aligning your hypotheses and analyses tightly with that model.

The methodology section requires more detail and transparency to allow replication and to enable readers to judge the robustness of the findings. Critical elements that should be clarified include sampling strategy (inclusion/exclusion criteria, recruitment procedure, and sample size justification or a priori power analysis), measurement instruments (with example items and reliability/validity evidence), and procedural steps (timeline, setting, and controls). Consider following reporting standards relevant to your field (e.g., APA, CONSORT, STROBE, PRISMA, or EQUATOR guidelines) to ensure completeness.

The statistical analysis strategy is generally appropriate, but the reporting and justification of the chosen methods need to be strengthened. The manuscript should clearly state the assumptions underlying each analysis, how these assumptions were tested, and what corrective actions were taken if they were violated (e.g., transformations, robust estimators, nonparametric tests). Additionally, effect sizes and confidence intervals should be systematically reported alongside p-values, and multiple comparison issues should be explicitly discussed if numerous tests are performed.

The presentation of results is at times difficult to follow because the narrative does not always map cleanly onto the tables and figures. I recommend restructuring this section so that each paragraph addresses one specific hypothesis or research question, explicitly referencing the corresponding table/figure and statistical indices. Tables and figures should be fully interpretable on their own (self-contained titles, labeled variables, units, and notes explaining abbreviations), and any redundant information between text and tables should be minimized.

The discussion section would benefit from a clearer hierarchy of contributions and a more critical interpretation of the findings. At the outset, you could succinctly restate the main results in relation to the original research questions and then explicitly articulate what is theoretically, empirically, or practically novel about your work. Moreover, the discussion should more systematically contrast your results with prior literature (agreement, disagreement, extension) and explore plausible mechanisms rather than restating the findings in different words.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.