


The Effectiveness of Emotion Regulation Training on Self-Awareness in Female University Students

Behnaz. Baghdadi¹, Sara. Haghghat^{2*}

¹ M.A., Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: sarahhghat58@yahoo.com

Editor

Parisa Nilforooshan^{id}
Professor of Psychology Associate
Professor, Counseling Department,
Faculty of Educational Sciences and
Psychology, Isfahan University,
Isfahan
p.nilforooshan@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Farhad Namjoo^{id}
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca
Reviewer 2: Manijeh Daneshpour^{id}
Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University,
California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The phrase "purposive sampling" is used. However, it would be beneficial to clarify how participants were selected within this method and why purposive sampling was deemed appropriate for this quasi-experimental design.

In the description of the control group, it is stated that they did not receive any intervention. Consider providing more detail on the activities or sessions (if any) the control group engaged in during the experimental period to account for potential external influences.

The results are briefly compared to a few previous studies, but this comparison could be expanded. For instance, directly contrast findings on the effectiveness of emotion regulation training with studies on similar populations or different educational interventions.

The increase in public self-consciousness in the experimental group is notable, but the paper does not thoroughly discuss why this specific aspect of self-consciousness may have increased with emotion regulation training. More elaboration is needed.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The inclusion criteria mention "absence of physical or psychological disorders." Please specify how this was assessed (e.g., through self-report, medical records, or psychological evaluations) to ensure transparency in participant selection.

The explanation of the Self-Consciousness Scale includes the scoring instructions, but it would be clearer if a brief explanation of what private, public, and social anxiety subscales represent in terms of self-awareness is included.

The intervention based on Gross's (2007) model is well-explained, but it would be helpful to provide additional information on how the sessions were delivered (e.g., individual vs. group, online vs. in-person) and whether the same facilitator led all sessions.

In describing the individual sessions, there is little indication of how participant progress was assessed or tracked between sessions. Adding more detail on session evaluations could strengthen the explanation of how the intervention was adjusted (if needed) during the program.

The choice of ANCOVA is appropriate, but further justification for using this method over other potential approaches (e.g., MANOVA) could be added to emphasize why this statistical method was the best fit for the data.

While Table 1 provides a clear presentation of pre-test and post-test scores, it would be helpful to discuss how these scores align with previous research findings or expected outcomes, especially in terms of the increase in social anxiety.

The presentation of statistical results in Table 3 includes the F-values and significance levels, but the inclusion of effect sizes (e.g., Cohen's *d*) would offer a clearer understanding of the practical significance of the findings.

In the discussion of results, it would be beneficial to address the generalizability of the findings, particularly given that the sample consists solely of female university students. Consider adding a comment on how the results may differ in male or non-student populations.

The authors mention the lack of follow-up assessments as a limitation. However, it would also be useful to discuss the potential limitation of using self-report measures for self-awareness, as these are prone to social desirability bias.

While the article mentions adherence to the Helsinki Declaration, it would be helpful to elaborate on how informed consent was obtained and whether there were any specific ethical concerns addressed during the intervention.

There is a brief mention of the control group's lack of improvement in self-awareness. A more thorough discussion of why the control group remained static in their scores, and how this relates to the intervention, would provide a fuller picture.

The paper describes the 8-week intervention, but does not discuss why this duration was chosen or whether there is any evidence to suggest that a longer or shorter intervention might have different outcomes. Please add a rationale for the duration.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.