International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Volume 14 · Issue 3 · e162786

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Relationship Between Trauma History and Emotion Dysregulation: The Moderating Role of Locus of Control

Sepideh Gerami, Masoume Pourmohamadreza-Tajrishi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 May 2025	9 Aug 2025	17 Aug 2025	10.5812/ijhrba-162786

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 9
Authors' reply to reviewers 10
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

4 comments · 11 Jul 2025 – 26 Jul 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 11 Jul 2025

Thanks for your paper and its practical topic. In my opinion, it needs some revisions, which I will list below:

Objectives:
1- In line 2, should it be "emotion regulation" or emotional dysregulation? Your title mentions emotion dysregulation...

Methods:
1- What method did you use to determine your sample size?
2- What were your inclusion and exclusion criteria?
Just age and trauma history?
There is no mention of exclusion criteria.
3- (The psychometric properties of the RLCS are well-supported in various studies [31], with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91 reported in recent research [32]): Please refer to the original version in which the Iranian validity of this questionnaire was assessed and cite it in the references.
4- (Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R):Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.78 to 0.82, and reliable stability over time, with test-retest correlations between 0.79 and 0.89. (Joseph, 2000; Weiss & Marmar, 1997).): The in-text referencing method is incorrect. Please correct it.

Discussion:
1- In line 2, should it be "emotion regulation" or emotional dysregulation?
2- Third and fourth paragraphs: There is no need to repeat the statistical method in the discussion; you should explain your results and relate them to other research...

References:
1- Please recheck references 19 and 33.
I couldn't find them.

Please re-check your paper for grammar and language.

Best regards to you.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 24 Jul 2025

I would like to thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. I have read the article carefully. While it covers an interesting topic, several concerns lead me to recommend major revisions. My reasons for this decision are as follows:
ABSTRACT
The abstract could benefit from a more explicit mention of potential interventions or practical applications based on the study's findings. While it suggests fostering personal agency, it could provide examples or brief recommendations for how this might be achieved in clinical settings.
INTRODUCTION
Consider incorporating more recent studies to ensure the literature review reflects the latest research findings. This could enhance the credibility and relevance of the introduction.
While the introduction mentions the unexplored aspects of trauma type and timing, providing more specific

examples or hypotheses about how these factors might interact with locus of control could enrich the narrative.
Although the introduction defines key terms, additional clarification on how these definitions apply to the study's context (e.g., specific age groups or types of trauma) could be beneficial.
The transition from the literature review to the study's objectives could be smoother by explicitly linking the identified gaps to the research aims. This would help readers understand the study's significance without needing to infer connections.
METHODS
Provide more details on the demographic distribution (e.g., gender, socioeconomic status) to better understand the sample's diversity.
Clarify how the instruments were adapted or validated for the specific population (if applicable) and discuss any potential cultural biases, especially with the Persian version of the IES-R.
Elaborate on the steps taken to ensure the validity of the regression analysis, such as checking for multicollinearity, normality, and homoscedasticity. Describe any data cleaning procedures used to address missing or incomplete responses.
DISCUSSION
While the discussion acknowledges the cross-sectional nature of the study, it could further elaborate on the limitations of making causal inferences and discuss potential confounding variables that might influence the observed relationships.
The discussion could be strengthened by integrating the findings with broader psychological theories, such as those related to trauma, emotion regulation, and locus of control. This would provide a more theoretical grounding to the empirical observations.
The discussion could delve deeper into the mechanisms behind why an external locus of control might exacerbate emotion regulation difficulties following trauma. This could involve exploring psychological processes such as learned helplessness or attributional styles.
While the discussion mentions the need for diverse samples, it could further discuss how cultural, socioeconomic, or gender differences might impact locus of control and emotion regulation, thus affecting the generalizability of the findings.
Although the discussion suggests cognitive-behavioral strategies to shift locus of control, it could provide more detail on what these interventions might look like in practice, potentially citing examples from the literature or existing therapeutic approaches.
Ensure that all suggestions for future research are clearly stated and distinct from each other. For example, while mentioning different trauma types, it might be beneficial to specify what these are and how they might differentially impact emotion regulation.

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 26 Jul 2025

Major Revision

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 26 Jul 2025

Major Revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Greetings and respectful regards

Thank you for reviewing the manuscript. I would like to inform you that all comments from the esteemed reviewers have been addressed. The revisions have been made in the current file and in the manuscript document, following the directions of Reviewer 1 (highlighted in red) and Reviewer 2 (highlighted in green).

Best regards

Corresponding Author

Reviewer 1:
I would like to thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. I have read the article carefully. While it covers an interesting topic, several concerns lead me to recommend major revisions. My reasons for this decision are as follows:

ABSTRACT
The abstract could benefit from a more explicit mention of potential interventions or practical applications based on the study's findings. While it suggests fostering personal agency, it could provide examples or brief recommendations for how this might be achieved in clinical settings.

Answer: It was revised and considered in the conclusion of abstract.

INTRODUCTION
Consider incorporating more recent studies to ensure the literature review reflects the latest research findings. This could enhance the credibility and relevance of the introduction.
While the introduction mentions the unexplored aspects of trauma type and timing, providing more specific examples or hypotheses about how these factors might interact with locus of control could enrich the narrative.
Although the introduction defines key terms, additional clarification on how these definitions apply to the study's context (e.g., specific age groups or types of trauma) could be beneficial.

The transition from the literature review to the study's objectives could be smoother by explicitly linking the identified gaps to the research aims. This would help readers understand the study's significance without needing to infer connections.

Answer: All comments relating to introduction and objective sections were considered and this section was revised thoroughly.

METHODS
Provide more details on the demographic distribution (e.g., gender, socio-economic status) to better understand the sample's diversity.
Clarify how the instruments were adapted or validated for the specific population (if applicable) and discuss any potential cultural biases, especially with the Persian version of the IES-R.

Elaborate on the steps taken to ensure the validity of the regression analysis, such as checking for multicollinearity, normality, and homoscedasticity. Describe any data cleaning procedures used to address missing or incomplete responses.

Answer: Method section was revised according to the comments.

DISCUSSION
While the discussion acknowledges the cross-sectional nature of the study, it could further elaborate on the limitations of making causal inferences and discuss potential confounding variables that might influence the observed relationships.
The discussion could be strengthened by integrating the findings with broader psychological theories, such as those related to trauma, emotion regulation, and locus of control. This would provide a more theoretical grounding to the empirical observations.
The discussion could delve deeper into the mechanisms behind why an external locus of control might exacerbate emotion regulation difficulties following trauma. This could involve exploring psychological processes such as learned helplessness or attributional styles.
While the discussion mentions the need for diverse samples, it could further discuss how cultural, socioeconomic, or gender differences might impact locus of control and emotion regulation, thus affecting the generalizability of the findings.
Although the discussion suggests cognitive-behavioral strategies to shift locus of control, it could provide more detail on what these interventions might look like in practice, potentially citing examples from the literature or existing therapeutic approaches.
Ensure that all suggestions for future research are clearly stated and distinct from each other. For example, while mentioning different trauma types, it might be beneficial to specify what these are and how they might differentially impact emotion regulation.

Answer: The discussion section was revised and addressed according to reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer 2:
Thanks for your paper and its practical topic, In my opinion it needs some revisions which I will put for you below:

Objectives:
1- In line 2 "emotion regulation" or emotional dysregulation ?Your title mentions emotion dysregulation...

Answer: It was revised and mentioned.

Methods:
1-What method did you use to determine your sample size?

Answer: It was mentioned.
2-What were your inclusion and exclusion criteria?
Just age and trauma history? No mention of exclusion....

Answer: It was revised and addressed.
3-(The psychometric properties of the RLCS are well-supported in various studies [31], with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91 reported in recent research [32]) :Please refer to the original version that assessed the Iranian validity of this questionnaire and cite it in the references.

Answer: It was added.
4-(Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R):Cronbach’s alpha ranging from 0.78 to 0.82, and reliable stability over time, with test-retest correlations between 0.79 and 0.89. (Joseph, 2000; Weiss & Marmar,1997).):The in-text referencing method is incorrect. Please correct it.

Answer: It was revised.

Discussion:
1-In line 2 "emotion regulation" or emotional dysregulation ?

Answer: It was changed to dysregulation.
2-Third and fourth paragraphs : There is no need to repeat the statistical method in the discussion, you should explain your results and relate them to other research...

Answer: It was revised.

References :
1-Please recheck references 19 and 33. I couldn't find them.

Answer: It was done.
Please re-check your paper for grammar and language.

Answer: The manuscript was thoroughly revised base on grammar and language.
Best regards to you.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 4 Aug 2025

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 4 Aug 2025

Dear author,
The changes are acceptable, but the article is bulky.
regards,

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Sir/Madam

Hello,

Thank you for your valuable feedback. We would like to inform you that the manuscript has been reduced from 5,632 words to 4,910 words. Additionally, all sections have been thoroughly rewritten, with the changes highlighted in yellow for your review.

We appreciate your constructive input and hope the revised version meets your expectations.

Best Regards

Corresponding Author

EIC 0:
Dear author,
the changes are acceptable, but the article is bulky.
regards,

Answer: The manuscript has been reduced from 5,632 words to 4,910 words.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Aug 2025

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 17 Aug 2025

accept