



The Relationship Between Early Maladaptive Schemas and Social Anxiety with the Mediation of Emotion Regulation in Female Students


Hanieh. Zadfallah Farshami^{1*}, Azam. Roshandel²

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



² PhD in Health Psychology, Department of Medical Sciences, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Haniehfarshami@gmail.com

Editor

Firouzeh Sepehrianazar
Professor of Psychology
Department, Urmia University, Iran
f.sepehrianazar@urmia.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Nadereh Saadati
Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University,
California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu
Reviewer 2: Farideh Dokanehi Fard
Associate Professor, Counseling Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Roudehen, Iran. Email: f.dokaneifard@riau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statistics on the prevalence of social anxiety could benefit from additional sources or comparative global data, providing a broader context beyond Ghazanfar and Naderi's findings in Iran.

The statement, "Early maladaptive schemas significantly influence how individuals think, feel, and interact with others," would benefit from referencing additional studies to strengthen the claim. Consider adding recent sources from 2020-2024.

The sentence, "Garnefski and colleagues reported satisfactory validity and reliability," should be expanded with specific reliability and validity coefficients for each subscale of the CERQ for transparency.

When introducing the software used (SPSS and Smart PLS), briefly explain why both were required. Clarifying the roles of each software package will improve methodological transparency.

In describing the GOF index, elaborate on why a value of 0.765 represents a "strong fit" for this specific study's model. This can improve readers' understanding of the index's implications.

The term "significant at the 0.05 level" is used without describing how significance was determined. It would be beneficial to specify the bootstrapping method details, including the number of samples generated.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

When discussing the domains of maladaptive schemas, the list ("disconnection and rejection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits...") could be clarified by briefly describing each domain or grouping them into broader categories if space permits.

In describing the sample size determination, include the specific parameters used in Cochran's formula (e.g., confidence level, margin of error) to make the calculation method transparent for reproducibility.

The description of the Social Phobia Inventory lacks the specific rationale for selecting this tool over others. Briefly address why this inventory was preferred and its appropriateness for this population.

Provide a brief description of the domains within the Young Schema Questionnaire, as readers may not be familiar with this tool. This can enhance the clarity of what the scores represent.

The demographic data are only briefly summarized. Consider adding a table with additional demographics, such as age range and academic year, to provide a fuller picture of the sample characteristics.

This table lists significant correlations but does not indicate confidence intervals. Adding these intervals would provide readers with more precise estimates of the relationships' strengths.

The structural model figure lacks a clear legend explaining the various elements, such as what the arrows represent. A legend or short description in the caption would aid reader comprehension.

The statement, "Early maladaptive schemas are the deepest psychological structures..." is somewhat vague. Provide specific examples or references that support this conceptualization to add clarity.

When discussing coping mechanisms and emotional regulation, consider expanding on how these findings might differ for non-student populations. This could highlight the study's relevance and any limitations related to the sample.

The comparison with Nadri et al. and Farrokhzadian et al. could benefit from additional details on these studies' sample and design differences to clarify why conflicting findings might have arisen.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.