

# Modeling the Relationships Between Coping Styles, Illness Perception, Perceived Social Support, and Psychological Resilience in Patients with Chronic Migraine

Ezzatollah. Kordmirza Nikoozadeh<sup>1</sup>, Fatemeh. Karfeh Raveshi<sup>2</sup>, Saranaz. Moghimi<sup>2</sup>, Amin. Rafiepoor<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

<sup>2</sup> Ph.D. Candidate in Health Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

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

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Niloofar Mikaeili Professor of Psychology Department of Mohaghegh Ardabili University, Ardabil, Iran nmikaeili@uma.ac.ir	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Kamdin Parsakia Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Ali Khodaei Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph would benefit from prevalence statistics or epidemiological data to emphasize the condition's relevance and impact.

The sentence "Coping strategies are often categorized..." should be supported by citation of the theoretical model (e.g., Lazarus & Folkman) or an updated framework for coping styles.

For each instrument (e.g., CD-RISC, CISS), it would strengthen the manuscript to report the exact Cronbach's alpha for the current sample, not only rely on past validation studies.

Please clarify whether assumptions for linear regression (normality, multicollinearity, homoscedasticity) were formally tested and met—this is only briefly stated later in results.

The variable "Illness Perception (Negative)" in Table 1 is ambiguous. Clarify whether this is a composite score or a subscale score. If it's a summative inverse score, define it clearly.

This table appears unrelated to the main focus of the study. It may have been copied from another manuscript. Please remove or revise accordingly.

The discussion of avoidance coping is vague. Despite reporting a significant ( $p = .003$ ) correlation, you describe it as “statistically non-significant” later. Please correct this inconsistency.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

It would be more robust to specify whether this support is instrumental, informational, or emotional, as these forms may differentially impact resilience.

The sentence “To address these gaps...” is appropriate, but the hypothesis or research questions are not clearly defined. Consider adding an explicit hypothesis or set of research aims.

Given the large sample size, please justify the use of convenience sampling and address its limitations in terms of external validity.

Although the Pearson correlations are reported, the directionality of relationships is not visually depicted (e.g., path diagram or correlation matrix). A diagram could aid clarity.

This table does not include all five predictors, despite being referenced earlier. Was a stepwise regression or multiple models used? Please clarify the modeling approach in the text.

The statement that results “align with and expand upon existing literature” is too general. Be more specific about which novel contributions this study makes.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.