




Cognitive Fusion as a Mediator Between Anxiety Sensitivity and Avoidant Coping in Young Women

Arjun. Deshmukh¹, Liang. Chen^{2*}, Brian. Matthews³


¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India

² Department of Educational Psychology, Fudan University, Shanghai, China



³ Department of Health Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

* Corresponding author email address: liang.chen@fudan.edu.cn

Editor

Niloofer Mikaeili
Professor of Psychology
Department of Mohaghegh Ardabili
University, Ardabil, Iran
nmikaeili@uma.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei
Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities
Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: 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:

In paragraph 1, the sentence “Avoidant coping...has been linked to adverse psychological outcomes...” could benefit from a clearer theoretical grounding. Consider explicitly referencing a theoretical model (e.g., Lazarus & Folkman’s transactional model of stress) to situate avoidant coping within a broader psychological framework.

Although the introduction later discusses Chinese cultural context, this does not appear until the final paragraph. Introduce the cultural focus earlier to frame the rationale for sample selection from the outset.

The model fit indices used (CFI, TLI, RMSEA) are appropriate, but it would be helpful to justify why these were selected over others (e.g., SRMR) and whether cutoff values followed Hu & Bentler (1999) or other guidelines.

In the sentence “These mean scores reflect moderate to high psychological vulnerability...”, explain what thresholds define “moderate to high” and whether these values are high compared to norms in other studies using the same tools.

In Table 2, while correlation coefficients are significant, reporting Cohen’s benchmarks for effect sizes (e.g., moderate, strong) would add interpretive value.

The sentence “Women, particularly in cultures with strong social expectations...” could be expanded with reference to empirical evidence on gender-role socialization in Chinese culture and its influence on cognitive-affective processes.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph that begins with “A growing body of literature suggests that cognitive fusion...” lacks a smooth transition. Consider adding a bridging sentence that explains why cognitive fusion is a particularly relevant mediator before introducing it as a focal construct.

In the sentence “Cognitive fusion is also implicated in the maintenance of psychological inflexibility...”, clarify how cognitive fusion differs from or overlaps with psychological inflexibility, as both are constructs within ACT.

In the "Avoidant Coping" section, the phrase “the avoidant coping dimension is typically represented by four subscales...” could be misinterpreted. Specify exactly which subscales were used and whether they were combined or analyzed separately.

The Methods section lacks Cronbach’s alpha values for the instruments in the current study. This is essential to demonstrate internal reliability within this specific population.

The description “cognitive fusion partially mediated the relationship...” should include a brief reference to the proportion of the total effect accounted for by the mediator, not just the standardized β .

In the sentence “The finding that cognitive fusion acts as a partial rather than full mediator...”, the authors suggest other factors might be relevant but do not discuss these in depth. Briefly discuss possible competing mediators like rumination or intolerance of uncertainty.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.