




Rejection Sensitivity and Attachment Avoidance as Predictors of Intimacy Struggles in Romantic Relationships

Karina. Batthyany¹, Carlos. Hernández^{2*}

¹ Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

² Department of Educational Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

* Corresponding author email address: carlos.hernandez@udg.mx

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Silvia Helena Koller  Faculty member, Universidade Federal do Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil silvia.koller@pq.cnpq.br	Reviewer 1: Ali Akbar Soleymanian  Associate Professor of Counseling Department, Bojnord University, Iran. Email: Soleymanian@ub.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Hajar Torkan  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Isfahan, Iran. h.torkan@khuif.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Avoidantly attached individuals tend to minimize emotional expression...” should specify whether this is a trait-like disposition or a context-dependent strategy. Clarification would aid theoretical precision.

The authors mention “cultural considerations,” yet do not elaborate on how Mexican relational norms might influence attachment behaviors. Including a culturally-specific citation (e.g., Latinx relational schemas) would enhance depth.

The interpretation “indicating a relatively elevated presence...” is speculative unless benchmark scores or clinical cutoffs are provided. Please clarify what counts as “elevated.”

The authors write that “these variables may co-occur and jointly contribute to relational difficulties,” yet the statistical analysis does not formally test interaction effects. Consider noting this and suggesting it as a future direction.

While the regression coefficients are clearly presented, consider reporting the standardized coefficients (β) in the table itself for easier interpretation of effect size comparisons.

When discussing “technological influences,” the article would be enriched by a more critical engagement with bidirectional effects—e.g., how individuals with intimacy struggles might gravitate toward digital avoidance.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

When discussing the “interactive and potentially compounding effects” of rejection sensitivity and attachment avoidance, consider adding a theoretical framework such as the dual vulnerability model to anchor this claim.

The discussion of technology and intimacy (e.g., “normalization of multitasking...”) is insightful. However, the argument would benefit from stronger empirical integration—include more recent studies beyond 2016 and 2020.

The inclusion of the Breusch-Pagan test is commendable. However, the authors should also mention skewness and kurtosis values or histograms for residuals to strengthen the normality assessment.

The authors state, “each made a significant unique contribution...”—it would be more informative to explain the practical implications of these findings. How might a .62 or .53 increase in score affect real-life relational dynamics?

The sentence “avoidant individuals may consistently maintain emotional distance...” would benefit from integration of empirical evidence showing behavioral stability of attachment styles in romantic contexts.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.