Determining the Predictive Contribution of Addiction Readiness Based on Identity Styles with the Mediation of Self-Differentiation and Social Problem-Solving in Prisoners of Isfahan Province

Hamid. Kazemi Zahrani[1*] , Elahe. Ebrahimi Alavijeh[2]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Master's degree student, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Najaf Abad, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: Hkazemi@pnu.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Izet Pehlić Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	**Reviewer 1:** Fahime Bahonar Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir **Reviewer 2:** Zahra Yousefi Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Z.yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

"Among the key factors influencing addiction readiness is an individual's acquisition of various identity styles." This statement would be clearer if it briefly defined or exemplified the three identity styles mentioned later—informational, normative, and diffuse-avoidant.

The rationale for choosing PLS-SEM over other techniques (e.g., covariance-based SEM) should be explicitly stated beyond just sample size and non-normality, particularly highlighting model complexity or formative constructs if applicable.

The K-S test results show several variables are non-normally distributed (e.g., social problem-solving, emotional cutoff). However, no transformations or robustness checks are reported. Consider adding a justification for proceeding with SEM or mention of bootstrapping.

The removal of indicators from self-differentiation (e.g., "I" Position and Fusion with Others) should be theoretically justified. These are key subdimensions in Bowen theory and may alter the construct's content validity.

Several items with low factor loadings were removed, but the authors do not specify how many items remained for each identity style or whether the final structure was reassessed for construct validity.

The Cronbach's alpha for Normative Identity Style is 0.69, which is below the recommended threshold. Consider acknowledging this limitation and exploring whether item reduction contributed to low reliability.

The figure is referenced, but no interpretation is offered regarding the magnitude of the standardized estimates or their practical significance. Consider adding narrative context.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The reference to "Bowen referred to identity confusion as self-differentiation" is conceptually misleading. Bowen's theory treats self-differentiation as the ability to separate thoughts from feelings, not as identity confusion. Clarify or rephrase to avoid misinterpretation.

"Research on addiction in prisons has reported addiction prevalence rates ranging from 20% to 80%..." The vast range requires justification or citation of specific studies that explain contextual differences leading to this disparity.

The description omits an example item, which would help readers unfamiliar with the Zargar (2006) scale better understand what aspects of readiness it measures.

The authors mention "Marcia's (1996) identity status model" without citing the original or providing context. Readers unfamiliar with Marcia's work may struggle to connect it with the identity styles framework used.

The paragraph beginning "This finding is consistent with the research of Haji Hosseini and Hashemi (2019)..." restates results without providing deeper psychological interpretation. Elaborate how differentiation might buffer prisoners against addictive behaviors in the prison environment.

The discussion references Botvin (2002) but could be strengthened by linking the construct of social problem-solving to current cognitive-behavioral interventions used in correctional settings.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

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