





The Relationship Between Social Comparison Processes and Well-Being in Digital Environments

Seyed Mousa. Raeisi^{1*} 

¹ Department of Humanities, National University of Skills, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: smraeisi@tvu.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Seyed Hamid Atashpour  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran hamidatashpour@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Taher Tizdast  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: taher.tizdast@toniau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Meysam Sadeghi  Assistant Professor of Department of Cognitive Psychology, Higher Education Institute of Cognitive Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: m.sadeghi@icss.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While social comparison theory is appropriately introduced, the manuscript would benefit from explicitly distinguishing upward versus downward social comparison at this stage, rather than deferring their operationalization to later sections, to improve theoretical continuity.

The paragraph cites adolescent and young adult studies extensively. Please justify more explicitly why adult populations remain underexplored, rather than implying this gap indirectly, to strengthen the rationale for the current sample.

The authors define hedonic and eudaimonic well-being clearly, but the paragraph would benefit from explicitly mapping each well-being dimension to the specific instruments used later, enhancing conceptual–methodological alignment.

Internal consistency is mentioned generally. Please report Cronbach's alpha values for each subscale explicitly in the text or a table, rather than only stating that they were acceptable.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “These findings suggest that social comparison functions not only as an isolated cognitive process...” would be strengthened by briefly clarifying whether the present study tests these pathways directly or treats them as contextual background.

This paragraph is well-developed, but the manuscript would benefit from explicitly stating why variables such as self-compassion or emotion regulation were not included in the current model, given their relevance.

The authors appropriately identify gaps; however, they should state more explicitly how the current study advances beyond prior correlational designs, beyond simply changing the population.

The aim is clearly articulated, but it would be beneficial to explicitly mention gender moderation here, since moderation analysis is a key analytic contribution of the study.

The description of convenience sampling is clear; however, please discuss potential sampling bias more explicitly, particularly given the combination of online and offline recruitment.

The exclusion criterion “self-reported severe psychiatric disorders” requires clarification. Please specify how this was assessed (single screening item, checklist, or self-identification) to enhance methodological transparency.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.