

# The Relationship Between Childhood Trauma and Personality Traits with Attitudes Toward Childbearing in Married Women Aged 25–45

Hakime. Dastani Hossein Abadi<sup>1</sup>, Samad. Shirinzadeh<sup>2\*</sup>, Marzieh. Poursalehy<sup>2</sup>, Alireza. Mollazadeh<sup>3</sup>

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

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



<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, Ash.C., Islamic Azad University, Ashtian, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: 1672022711@iau.ir

### Editor

Donatella Di Corrado  
Associate Professor, Department of  
psychology, Kore University of  
Enna, Enna, Italy  
donatella.dicorrado@unikore.it

### 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:** Nadereh Saadati  
Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University,  
California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph, the sentence “prior studies have emphasized the role of structural and contextual variables...” presents several determinants but does not critically synthesize them; instead, it lists them descriptively. The manuscript would benefit from integrating these variables into a coherent theoretical model explaining how they interact to shape attitudes toward childbearing rather than treating them as isolated predictors.

The third paragraph states “Childhood trauma... has been consistently linked to a wide range of maladaptive outcomes,” yet the argument would be strengthened by specifying effect sizes or meta-analytic evidence. Currently, the statement remains general and lacks quantitative grounding, which reduces its scientific rigor.

In the paragraph beginning “Furthermore, trauma-informed frameworks suggest...,” the manuscript introduces schemas but does not specify which schema theory (e.g., Young’s schema theory). This theoretical ambiguity should be resolved by explicitly naming the framework and aligning the constructs (e.g., abandonment schema, mistrust schema) with childbearing attitudes.

The sampling strategy “convenience sampling method” is acknowledged, but no discussion is provided regarding sampling bias. It is recommended to explicitly address potential selection bias and its implications for external validity.

In the Measures section, the description of the AFCS includes “the Persian version used in this study includes 23 items,” but no citation is provided for the validation of this adapted version. This omission raises concerns regarding construct validity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph discussing “Empirical findings support this perspective...” includes multiple constructs such as dissociation and personality pathology, but the linkage to attitudes toward childbearing is indirect. The authors should explicitly articulate the mediational pathway rather than assuming inferential continuity.

In the personality traits paragraph (“In parallel, personality traits have been identified...”), the Five-Factor Model is introduced, but no justification is provided for selecting this model over alternative personality frameworks (e.g., HEXACO). A brief rationale would enhance theoretical justification.

The sentence “Traits such as extraversion... have been linked to diverse outcomes” lacks citations immediately after each trait-outcome claim. It is recommended to align each specific claim (e.g., extraversion → social engagement) with empirical references rather than grouping them under a general citation.

In the paragraph “The interaction between childhood trauma and personality traits...,” the manuscript proposes a bidirectional relationship but does not clarify whether the study empirically tests mediation or moderation. This creates a conceptual–methodological mismatch that should be resolved.

The final paragraph of the Introduction states “relatively limited attention has been paid...” but does not provide a systematic gap analysis. It is recommended to explicitly identify at least two or three key empirical gaps (e.g., lack of non-clinical samples, lack of simultaneous modeling) with supporting citations.

The Methods section begins with “The present study was fundamental...”; however, the term “fundamental” is ambiguous in research design terminology. It should be replaced with a more precise classification (e.g., cross-sectional correlational study) to align with international standards.

In the “Study design and Participant” paragraph, the justification “15 to 20 participants per examined relationship” is vague because the number of predictors is not explicitly stated. The authors should clarify the power analysis or specify the number of predictors used to justify sample size adequacy.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.