





Proposing a Model for Predicting Self-Efficacy Based on Early Maladaptive Schemas Mediated by the Meaning of Life in Remarried Couples

Esmail. Firouzi¹, Farideh. Dokaneifard^{2*}, Afsaneh. Bostan²

¹ PhD student, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Farideh.Dokaneifard@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mohsen Golparvar  Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran mgolparvar@khuif.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran. Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Stephen C. L. Lau  Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The authors state that “individuals’ experiences in remarriage are significantly influenced by the failure of their first marriage” (p. 11), but no citation supports this critical claim. Consider adding empirical references to substantiate this foundational assumption.

The term “descriptive, correlational, consistent, and predictive” appears vague and potentially redundant. Consider refining the methodological classification for clarity and alignment with common research terminology.

The scale is referred to as a 75-item instrument, yet there is mention of the “short form.” Please clarify whether the 75-item version or the 90-item long form was used, and resolve this apparent contradiction.

Inconsistent use of reverse-coded items is reported: “items 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9 (reverse-coded).” According to the original MLQ structure, only item 9 is reverse-coded in the presence subscale. Please double-check and correct this scoring instruction.

The article states that SEM was conducted with SPSS. However, SPSS does not support full SEM (only path analysis and regression). Was AMOS or another tool used? Please clarify the software and technique used for SEM.

The χ^2/df ratio for the initial model is 3.34, above the accepted threshold of 3. Please justify why this is considered an acceptable fit, or describe how the modifications led to a better-fitting model more clearly in the text.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Remarriage offers a second chance...” would benefit from a clearer transition to differentiate remarriage as a sociocultural phenomenon from its psychological implications. Please elaborate on how this transition affects schema development or self-efficacy.

When stating that “self-efficacy and optimistic expectations are linked to performance and health,” the authors could enhance credibility by briefly citing Bandura’s theoretical framework directly here to ground the concept historically.

The sentence “This study explores the mediating role of life meaning in this relationship” needs to be rephrased for clarity. The term “life meaning” should be made consistent throughout (vs. “meaning in life”) for terminological consistency.

The authors report a correlation of -0.279 between early maladaptive schemas and self-efficacy, yet describe it as “small to medium.” According to Cohen’s standard, this borders on a medium effect. Consider adding effect size interpretation in the text for clarity.

Only three indicators are shown for early maladaptive schemas. However, the instrument includes 15 schema domains. Why were only three chosen? Clarify how these were selected or justify reducing the dimensionality.

The structural model includes “42 variables,” including 23 latent variables, yet earlier only one latent construct was defined. This contradiction requires clarification. Please re-express this explanation or add a supplemental figure description.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.