

Examining The Relationship Between Academic Procrastination, Self-Compassion, and Epistemological Beliefs in High School Students

Nasrin. Ghorbani Afkhami¹, Marziyeh. Alivandi Vafa^{1*}, Roghayeh. Kiyani², Amir. Panahali³

¹ Department of Psychology, Ta.C, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

² Department of psychology, Ah.C., Islamic Azad University, Ahar, Iran

³ Department of Counseling, Ta.C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: dr.vafa@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Anela Hasanagic

Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Thseen Nazir

Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh

Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While ethical approval is mentioned, the manuscript does not specify whether parental consent was obtained for minors. Please clarify this in the section “Before data collection, the necessary approvals were obtained...”

In the paragraph starting “The Tuckman Procrastination Scale (TPS)...”, there is a discrepancy in the reported score range (16–80) and the descriptive statistics showing a mean of 116.436. This must be corrected for consistency.

The abstract states that self-compassion and epistemological beliefs were not significant predictors of procrastination, but Table 4 shows both predictors as statistically significant. This contradiction must be resolved.

In the paragraph “The results of the regression analysis, as shown in Table 3...”, an R^2 of 0.08 is interpreted as “moderate improvement.” In reality, 8% is a small effect size in social science; revise this phrasing accordingly.

Given the weak effect sizes, the paper would benefit from a post-hoc power analysis to determine whether the sample size was sufficient to detect meaningful effects.

In the paragraph “The present study examined the relationships...”, it is stated that the regression model was not significant, which contradicts the significant F-test result in Table 3. Clarify or correct this inconsistency.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning “Self-compassion has been identified as a protective factor...” repeats much of what has already been stated in the previous paragraph. Consider condensing the discussion of self-compassion to avoid redundancy and improve narrative flow.

In the paragraph that starts “Epistemological beliefs, which refer to individuals’ beliefs about the nature of knowledge...”, the term “sophisticated epistemological beliefs” is used repeatedly without operational definition. Provide a clear definition or examples to help readers understand what constitutes “sophisticated.”

In the same section, the authors use “senior high school students” but later break this into 10th to 12th grades. Clarify if “senior” includes all these grades or only 11th and 12th, and use consistent terminology throughout.

The statement “Self-compassion and epistemological beliefs may not be strong determinants...” overreaches given the significant regression results. Consider rephrasing to reflect the modest yet statistically significant effect.

The discussion could benefit from a clearer linkage to existing theories such as Self-Determination Theory or Social Cognitive Theory, especially in interpreting the role of self-compassion and epistemological beliefs.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.