



# Presenting a Model of the Effect of Cognitive Bias on Mental Health and Quality of Life in Elderly Women with the Mediating Role of Mindfulness

Nahideh. Yousefpour<sup>1\*</sup> 



<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: nahidyousefpour97@pnu.ac.ir

### E d i t o r

Seyed Hamid Atashpour   
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran  
hamidatashpour@gmail.com

### R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri   
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@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:

In the second paragraph of the introduction, the sentence “Mental health in later life is not limited to the absence of psychiatric symptoms...” provides a broad conceptual definition, but it does not clearly link this multidimensional view to the operationalization used in the study (GHQ-28). It is recommended to justify how the chosen instrument captures these dimensions to strengthen construct validity alignment.

The paragraph introducing quality of life includes the sentence “Quality of life is a broad, multidimensional construct...” but remains largely descriptive. It would be beneficial to explicitly justify why SF-36 is the most appropriate instrument for elderly Iranian women, especially considering cultural sensitivity and contextual relevance.

The SF-36 description is detailed; however, the manuscript does not explain whether composite scores or subscale scores were used in SEM. This ambiguity affects interpretability of the model and should be clarified.

The Cognitive Bias Questionnaire is described briefly, but the manuscript does not provide example items or clarify whether it measures general bias or domain-specific bias. This weakens construct transparency.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the fourth paragraph, the conceptualization of cognitive bias is adequate; however, the manuscript does not clearly specify which theoretical model of cognitive bias underpins the study (e.g., Beck's cognitive theory, dual-process models). This omission weakens theoretical grounding and should be addressed.

The paragraph stating "The impact of cognitive bias extends beyond psychiatric symptomatology..." would benefit from clearer causal logic. Currently, the explanation moves from cognition to behavior without specifying mediating mechanisms (e.g., rumination, attentional bias), which should be clarified for theoretical rigor.

The introduction of mindfulness is conceptually sound, but the sentence "Mindfulness has been conceptualized as a receptive, nonjudgmental awareness..." lacks differentiation between trait mindfulness and state mindfulness. Since the study uses a self-report scale, this distinction should be clarified.

In the paragraph discussing mindfulness literature, the manuscript cites multiple intervention studies but does not distinguish between correlational and experimental evidence. This creates a risk of overstating causal inference and should be corrected.

The paragraph beginning with "The theoretical relevance of mindfulness to cognitive bias..." is important, but it lacks a clear conceptual model explaining how mindfulness disrupts biased cognition. A schematic or more explicit mediation logic would improve clarity.

The final paragraph of the introduction successfully leads to the research aim, but the transition is somewhat abrupt. The manuscript should explicitly articulate hypotheses (e.g., H1–H5) to align with the SEM framework used later.

In the "Study Design and Participants" section, the use of both convenience and purposive sampling is stated, but the rationale for combining these methods is not explained. This raises concerns about sampling bias and should be clarified.

The sentence "Based on G\*Power software calculations..." reports parameters (power = 0.99), which are unusually high for social science research. The authors should justify this choice, as it may suggest overestimation or misunderstanding of statistical power conventions.

In the "Measures" section, the description of the Mindfulness Questionnaire is adequate, but it lacks reporting of reliability indices specific to the current sample. Reporting Cronbach's alpha for this study is necessary.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.