




How Cognitive Avoidance and Perfectionism Predict Anxiety in Therapy-Seeking Adults

Zeynep. Acar¹, Selin. Kaya^{2*}

¹ Department of General Psychology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkiye

² Department of Clinical Psychology, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkiye

* Corresponding author email address: selin.kaya@boun.edu.tr

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic  Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei  Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The discussion of experiential avoidance would be improved by briefly delineating how it diverges from cognitive avoidance, rather than describing it as simply “closely related.” This would prevent conceptual conflation.

It would strengthen the rigor if the authors reported effect size indices (e.g., Cohen’s f^2) alongside R^2 values, particularly since the model accounts for a moderate portion of variance (30%).

” of avoidance strategies should be better anchored by referencing normative data or score thresholds from the CAQ manual.

The sentence “Linearity was confirmed through scatterplot inspection...” would benefit from specifying whether linearity was assessed for both predictors individually or for the model overall. This enhances replicability.

The phrase “These results suggest that both predictors together contribute meaningfully...” is somewhat vague. Consider specifying whether the contribution of each predictor was statistically significant when controlling for the other.

The authors state “These results support the notion...” but should explicitly connect their findings to the specific hypotheses posed. Doing so would increase internal consistency between aims and conclusions.

In the sentence “The results of this study also point to the combined influence...”, the term “combined influence” implies interaction, yet no interaction term was tested. Please clarify whether this refers to additive effects only.

The sentence “These theoretical perspectives reinforce our findings...” would be strengthened by outlining how each cited framework (biological, attachment-based) uniquely complements the observed data.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Indeed, both constructs may share overlapping mechanisms...” should be supported with more precise mechanistic explanations or referenced models (e.g., reinforcement theory, cognitive appraisal models) to enrich theoretical grounding.

The justification for focusing on a Turkish sample needs strengthening. Consider expanding on unique cultural characteristics (e.g., collectivist values, stigma around mental health) that may interact with perfectionism and avoidance.

The sentence “Higher scores reflect higher levels of perfectionism...” should clarify whether a total score was used in analysis or if subscale-level findings were explored. This is crucial since the FMPS includes both adaptive and maladaptive subcomponents.

In the sentence “These findings provide initial insight...”, the term “relatively frequent use

The phrase “maladaptive coping and high self-imposed standards often emerge...” should be better contextualized with specific cultural constructs relevant to Turkey (e.g., honor culture, academic pressure).

The authors note that “emotional processes associated with perfectionism and avoidance can be understood...” but miss the opportunity to tie these findings back to the emotional regulation literature, especially models like Gross's process model of emotion regulation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.