

# The Relationship between Self-Compassion, Interpersonal Emotion Regulation, and Coping Styles with Quality of Life in Women after Mastectomy Surgery


Faeze. Khalatbari<sup>1</sup>, Maryam. Asadolah Toyserkani<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology, Islamic Azad University, CT.C., Tehran, Iran



<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, ET.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: ma.asadolah@iau.ac.ir

### Editor

Mohsen Joshanloo  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Keimyung University, 1095 Dalgubeol Boulevard, Dalseo-Gu, Daegu 42601, South Korea  
mohsen.joshanloo@unimelb.edu.au

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammad Masoud Dayarian  
Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Komeinishar/Isfahan, Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Zahra Yousefi  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Z.yousefi1393@khuif.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Quality of life following mastectomy has therefore emerged as a central concern...” would benefit from a brief operational definition of “quality of life” in the oncology context. Currently, the construct is introduced broadly; please specify whether the study adopts the WHO biopsychosocial framework or another theoretical model at this early stage to improve conceptual clarity.

In the sentence “Substantial empirical literature demonstrates that higher self-compassion predicts lower psychological distress...”, the authors should explicitly state the assumed mechanism of influence (e.g., cognitive reappraisal, reduced self-criticism, emotional buffering). This will strengthen the theoretical rationale linking self-compassion to post-mastectomy outcomes.

The statement “support an integrative model of psychological adaptation” is theoretically ambitious. The manuscript should either formalize this model graphically or explicitly outline its components and directional pathways.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion of interpersonal emotion regulation is well-developed; however, the manuscript does not sufficiently distinguish intrapersonal from interpersonal emotion regulation processes. The sentence “Closely related to self-compassion is the broader construct of emotion regulation...” should be expanded to articulate how interpersonal regulation provides incremental explanatory value beyond traditional intrapersonal models.

The statement “Despite the growing body of research... there remains a critical need for empirical studies...” should specify exactly which empirical gaps are unresolved (e.g., absence of integrated models, lack of non-Western samples, limited post-mastectomy focus). This will sharpen the study’s contribution.

The phrase “selected through convenience sampling” raises concerns regarding selection bias. The authors should include a brief justification for this choice and discuss how it may affect external validity.

The statement “the assumptions of regression analysis were examined and confirmed” is too general. Please report specific statistics (e.g., VIF values, tolerance, skewness, kurtosis, residual plots).

In Table 4, the degrees of freedom for regression are reported as 1, which is inconsistent with the number of predictors entered. Please verify and correct the ANOVA table.

The intercept ( $B = 82.324$ ) appears unusually high relative to the observed scale range for quality of life. Please confirm the scoring procedure and ensure no transformation errors occurred.

The phrase “significantthe strongest positive predictors” contains a typographical error and should be corrected for clarity and professionalism.

The authors interpret problem-focused coping as universally adaptive; however, the literature indicates context-dependent effects. Please temper the conclusion or acknowledge this nuance.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.