IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 19 · Issue 2 · e145500

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Relationship Between Self-objectification and Social Anxiety in Adolescent Girls: Mediating Role of Self-worth and Concern About Body Image

Negar Sobhani, Mandana Niknam

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Jan 2024	4 Oct 2024	16 Mar 2025	10.5812/ijpbs-145500

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, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 20
4 **Revision 3** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 21
Authors' reply to reviewers 22
Reviewer and editor comments 24

1 Original submission

3 comments · 19 Feb 2024 – 4 Apr 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Feb 2024

My comments are as follows:
Comment 1: What is the type of study? I think the correct type is a correlational-analytical study.
Comment 2: The sampling method seems to be multi-stage cluster sampling, and the convenience sampling method is not correct.
Comment 3: Are all questionnaires localized? Please refer to the papers.
Comment 4: The statistical analysis section is incomplete. Please fully describe the statistical analysis used. Also, the goodness of fit criteria used, along with their interpretation, need to be explained in detail. In addition, the statistical software used needs to be fully specified in this part.
Comment 5: The results provide interesting information on the results of the study, but their interpretations were not provided in full.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 1 Apr 2024

Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

In addition to the opinion of the reviewer, please also address the following:
1. The dates of the study in the first and second abstracts of your manuscript are different; it seems that the correct date is the academic year of 2022/23.
2. Please change the name of the Self-worth scale to the "Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale (CSWS)".

3. Please add explanations about the psychometric evaluation results of the "Body Image concern inventory " in Iran.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments in which they have replied to all comments one by one.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 4 Apr 2024

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please make your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their point-by-point replies to all comments.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count

text.

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.

Manuscript number: 145500

Manuscript title: The relationship between self-objectification and social anxiety in adolescent girls: the mediating role of self-worth and concern about body image

Dear Editor-in-chief: Dr Zarghami

Our team appreciates the editor and the reviewers for their observations and comments on the manuscript. We have fulfilled their comments and suggestions and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the revised version of the manuscript are highlighted in text. Below, we also provide a point-by-point response explaining how we have addressed each of the reviewer and editors' comments.

Yours sincerely,

M. N.

Suggestion, Question, or Comment from the Editor	**Author's Response**	**Change in the Manuscript**
Reviewer 1		
Comment 1: What is the type of study? In my opinion, correlation-analytical study is correct.	It was modified and the research is correlational-analytical.	It is highlighted in the abstract and research method section
Comment 2: The sampling method seems to be a multi-stage cluster and the convenience sampling method is not correct.	It was modified	It is highlighted in the abstract and research method section

Comment 3: Are all questionnaires localized? Please refer to the papers.	Yes. The questionnaires are standard and have been used in Iran, and the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaires have been mentioned in Iranian articles for each of them.	They are highlighted in the research tools section
Comment 4: the statistical analysis section is incomplete. Please describe the statistical analysis used completely. Also, the goodness of fit criteria used along with their interpretation needs to be explained in detail. In addition, the statistical software used needs to state completely in this part.	The statistical analysis section was revised and interpretations were expressed.	highlighted in the findings section
Comment 5: The results provide interesting information on the results of the study, but its interpretations did not provide complete.	Done	It is highlighted in green in the discussion section
Reviewer 2		
1. The date of the study in the first and second abstracts of your manuscript is different, it seems that the	The date of the research was modified both in the abstract and in the research	It is highlighted in both the abstract and the research method

correct date is the academic year of 2022/23.	method section.	section
2. Please change the name of the Self-worth scale to the "Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale (CSWS)".	Done	It is highlighted in the abstract and research tools section
3. Adding explanations about the psychometric evaluation results of the "Body Image concern inventory " in Iran.	Done	It is highlighted in the research tools section

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 12 May 2024 – 6 Jun 2024

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 12 May 2024

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJPBS. I appreciate the effort and dedication you have put into your research. After a thorough evaluation, I would like to provide some constructive feedback to enhance the quality of your manuscript before considering it for publication.

Abstract

1. Lack of Background Information: The abstract fails to provide a clear and concise overview of the study's background and rationale. It would be advantageous to include a brief summary of prior research on the subject, emphasizing the existing knowledge gaps that the current study intends to fill.
2. Incorrect Study Design: The study design is not correlational; rather, it is cross-sectional. The entire text should be revised to accurately represent the methodology employed.

Methods

3. Inadequate description of the sampling method: The methods section does not provide sufficient details about how the clusters and participants were selected. It lacks information on the specific criteria used for cluster selection, the randomization process, and any potential biases in the sampling procedure.
4. Lack of Sample Size Calculation and Justification: The methods section lacks a clear calculation and justification for the chosen sample size. This calculation should consider factors such as the desired level of statistical power, anticipated effect size, expected variability, and significance level.
5. Lack of information on response rate: The methods section does not mention the response rate or the number of participants who completed the questionnaires. This information is important for assessing the representativeness of the sample and the potential for non-response bias.
6. Insufficient details on data collection procedure: Although the methods section mentions that the research questionnaires were provided to the participants through virtual social networks, it does not provide information on how the participants were contacted or how the data collection process was conducted. Details such as the timing of data collection, instructions given to participants, and any measures taken to ensure data quality are missing.
7. Lack of ethical considerations: The methods section does not mention any ethical considerations or procedures followed to ensure the protection of participants' rights and privacy. It is important to include information on obtaining informed consent, maintaining confidentiality, and complying with ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects.
8. Inadequate explanation of data analysis: The methods section states that the data were analyzed using SPSS and Amos software, but it does not provide details on the specific statistical tests or models employed. The statistical analysis section should be written according to the CHAMP checklist.

Results

9. Inappropriate presentation of variable values in Table 1 using means: It is evident from the methods section that these variables were measured using Likert scales and scored accordingly. Therefore, they are not continuous quantitative variables and should be presented using medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs). Additionally, non-parametric tests should be used for analysis.
10. Incorrect use of Pearson correlation analysis: In Table 2, Pearson correlation analysis was utilized to investigate the relationship between the independent variable, self-objectification, and the dependent variable, social anxiety, with the intention of evaluating the mediating effects of other variables (self-worth and body image concern), which is incorrect. Simple correlation analysis only measures the bivariate correlation between two variables and does not allow for the assessment of relationships and the adjustment

of other variable effects. To achieve this, partial correlation or multiple regression analysis can be employed instead.
11. Inappropriate Presentation of SEM Analysis Results: The results of the structural equation modeling analysis were not properly presented and interpreted. Interpreting SEM results involves evaluating model fit indices like RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), CFI (Comparative Fit Index), and TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) to assess how well the model describes the data. Values close to 0.06 for RMSEA or above 0.95 for CFI and TLI indicate a good fit. Examine path coefficients to understand the strength and direction of relationships between variables; significant coefficients (usually $p < 0.05$) suggest meaningful connections. Finally, review the squared multiple correlations for endogenous variables to gauge how much variance is explained by the model, providing insights into its predictive power. For more guidance, you can refer to a good article titled 'Model Setting and Interpretation of Results in Research Using Structural Equation Modeling: A Checklist with Guiding Questions for Reporting'.

I look forward to seeing the revisions based on this feedback.

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 1 Jun 2024

Thank you for your attention and effort in correcting the article according to the reviewers' comments. Your first revised manuscript has been reviewed by the reviewers, but there are still parts of the manuscript that need to be reviewed and corrected. Please make your revisions according to the reviewer's comments.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their replies to all comments one by one.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised text.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 6 Jun 2024

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. Revised text must be highlighted in the full manuscript file.

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.

Manuscript number: 145500

Manuscript title: The relationship between self-objectification and social anxiety in adolescent girls: the mediating role of self-worth and concern about body image

Dear Editor-in-chief: Dr Zarghami

Our team is grateful to the editor and referees for their observations and comments on the manuscript. We have accommodated their comments and suggestions and would like to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further review in the journal. Changes in the revised version of the manuscript are highlighted in the text. It is necessary to explain that because we did not know which stage of the arbitration to answer one by one, we have repeated the items desired by the judges in the previous two stages in this letter. Below, we also provide a point-by-point response that explains how we addressed each of the reviewers' and editors' comments.

I apologize for mentioning the name in the answer to the judges.

Yours sincerely,

Suggestion, Question, or Comment from the Editor	**Author's Response**	**Change in the Manuscript**
Reviewer 1		
1. Lack of Background Information: The abstract fails to provide a clear and concise overview of the study's background and rationale. It would be advantageous to include a brief summary of prior research on the subject, emphasizing the existing knowledge gaps that the current	The abstract was modified and an attempt was made to include a summary of previous research on the subject and to express the research gap.	This is highlighted in yellow at the beginning of the abstract (Background).

study intends to fill.		
Comment 2: Incorrect Study Design: The study design is not correlational; rather, it is cross-sectional. The entire text should be revised to accurately represent the methodology employed.	It was modified	It is highlighted in the abstract.
Comment 3: Inadequate description of the sampling method: The methods section does not provide sufficient details about how the clusters and participants were selected. It lacks information on the specific criteria used for cluster selection, the randomization process, and any potential biases in the sampling procedure.	The sampling method was described more precisely and step-by-step and highlighted in yellow in the text	They are highlighted in the research method.
4. Lack of Sample Size Calculation and Justification: The methods section lacks a clear calculation and justification for the chosen sample size. This calculation should consider factors such	The sample size was presented based on Cohen's proposed formula.	highlighted in the findings section

as the desired level of statistical power, anticipated effect size, expected variability, and significance level.		
Comment 5: Lack of information on response rate: The methods section does not mention the response rate or the number of participants who completed the questionnaires. This information is important for assessing the representativeness of the sample and the potential for non-response bias.	The total number of people to whom the questionnaire was sent was 461 teenage girls, some of them did not answer and some people had the same response pattern, which finally resulted in 384 questionnaires that could be examined.	It is highlighted in the research method section.
Comment 6: Insufficient details on data collection procedure: Although the methods section mentions that the research questionnaires were provided to the participants through virtual social networks, it does not provide information on how the participants were contacted or how the data collection process was conducted. Details such as the timing of data collection, instructions given to participants, and any measures taken to ensure data quality are missing.	Both in the sampling section and in the research implementation method section, it has been mentioned that with the help of school administrators, links to questionnaires were posted on virtual network channels. The time of data collection was from November 2022 to April 2023, which was also written in the text. At the beginning of the questionnaires, instructions and how to answer, ethical considerations were explained to the participants, which are	*1.* highlighted in yellow in the text. (in *Procedure)*

	highlighted in yellow in the text.	
Comment 7: Lack of ethical considerations: The methods section does not mention any ethical considerations or procedures followed to ensure the protection of participants' rights and privacy. It is important to include information on obtaining informed consent, maintaining confidentiality, and complying with ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects.	Ethical considerations were written in the Procedure section.	It is highlighted in the Procedure section. Page 5
Comment 8: Inadequate explanation of data analysis: The methods section states that the data were analyzed using SPSS and Amos software, but it does not provide details on the specific statistical tests or models employed. The statistical analysis section should be written according to the CHAMP checklist.	At the end of the Procedure section, explanations about the details of the statistical tests were written and highlighted.	Page 5
Comment 9: Inappropriate presentation of variable values in Table 1 using means: It is evident from the methods section that these variables were measured using Likert scales and scored accordingly. Therefore, they are not continuous	Parametric statistical methods were used due to the establishment of univariate and multivariate normality assumptions and also due to the high sample size. Table 1	

quantitative variables and should be presented using medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs). Additionally, non-parametric tests should be used for analysis.		
Comment 10: Incorrect use of Pearson correlation analysis: In Table 2, Pearson correlation analysis was utilized to investigate the relationship between the independent variable, self-objectification, and the dependent variable, social anxiety, with the intention of evaluating the mediating effects of other variables (self-worth and body image concern), which is incorrect. Simple correlation analysis only measures the bivariate correlation between two variables and does not allow for the assessment of relationships and the adjustment of other variable effects. To achieve this, partial correlation or multiple regression analysis can be employed instead.	Modified and partial correlation was used. Table 2	
Comment 11: Inappropriate Presentation of SEM Analysis Results: The results of the structural equation modeling analysis were not properly presented and interpreted. Interpreting	Considering the sometimes different values that exist in the field of fit indices, in this research, help was taken from this source: Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2016). *Applied*	

SEM results involves evaluating model fit indices like RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), CFI (Comparative Fit Index), and TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index) to assess how well the model describes the data. Values close to 0.06 for RMSEA or above 0.95 for CFI and TLI indicate a good fit. Examine path coefficients to understand the strength and direction of relationships between variables; significant coefficients (usually $p < 0.05$) suggest meaningful connections. Finally, review the squared multiple correlations for endogenous variables to gauge how much variance is explained by the model, providing insights into its predictive power. For more guidance, you can refer to a good article titled 'Model Setting and Interpretation of Results in Research Using Structural Equation Modeling: A Checklist with Guiding Questions for Reporting'.	*multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. Sage publications.	
Reviewer 2		
Comment 1: Please complete the statistical analysis section in detail.	The date of the research was modified both in the abstract and in the research	It is highlighted in both the abstract and the research method

	method section.	section
Comment 2: Lack of statistical measures: The abstract (methods and results) does not provide information on the specific statistical findings of the SEM model.	Done	It is highlighted in the abstract and research tools section
Comment 3: The information presented in Table 1 is incomplete. Please report the scores for each questionnaire and its subscales after converting to 100 scores so that they can be compared easily (here, the range is between 1 and 100 scores). Also, provide the main range of scores for each questionnaire and its subscales separately (here, the range is the minimum and maximum possible score of the questionnaire). *Comment 4: Please provide the p-values in Table 2.* *Comment 5: Interpretation of Figure 1 needs to be completed. Please interpret the coefficients completely.*	Done Done The interpretation of Figure 1 is complete.	It is highlighted in the table 1 It is highlighted in Table 2 It is highlighted in Figure 1 below
the last reviews		
Write and manage	Done	It is highlighted in pages

your references using EndNote software		11, 12
ease do not write the authors' full names in the Acknowledgment, Authors' Contribution, and submitted files (Reply to Reviewers) because we want to make our review process as blind as possible. We suggest writing only the first letter of your first name and last name. Example: In the acknowledgment part, instead of Sara Hamilton, you can write S.H.	done	because we did not know which stage of the arbitration to answer one by one, we have repeated the items desired by the judges in the previous two stages in this letter and highlighted them in yellow.
Control of Authors' Contribution: FAILED • In "Authors' Contribution," the first and last name of authors must be written only by capital letters of an abbreviation like **S.M.**	Done	It is highlighted in page 10
Control of Data Availability	Done	It is highlighted in page 10. We used template 3

3 Revision 2

4 comments · 21 Aug 2024 – 26 Sep 2024

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 21 Aug 2024

Dear Authors,

Your revisions have significantly enhanced the overall quality of the work. The clarity and depth of your analysis are much improved, and the changes you implemented reflect a thoughtful consideration of the feedback.

However, I would like to point out a minor issue regarding the statistical analysis section. The procedure and data analysis steps appear repeated twice, which may confuse readers. I recommend revising this section to ensure clarity and conciseness.

Thank you for your hard work!

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 14 Sep 2024

Comments to the Author
Dear,
The authors have addressed virtually all comments. Well done.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 26 Sep 2024

Thank you for your attention and for correcting the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. Your revised manuscript has been reviewed by the reviewers. Currently, your manuscript needs minor revision according to the reviewer's opinion, and this version also still needs reference formatting edits (for reference formatting, use Endnote software—note: in your current manuscript, reference 21 comes before reference 17). After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments in which they have replied to all comments one by one.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 26 Sep 2024

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised text.

4

Revision 3

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 Editor-in-Chief,

On behalf of our team, I would like to extend our sincere appreciation to you and the reviewers for your valuable feedback and insightful comments on our manuscript. We have carefully considered and addressed all the revisions as outlined in the review reports.

The updated manuscript, with all necessary corrections, has been highlighted in red for your convenience.

Manuscript Number: 145500

Manuscript Title: *The Relationship Between Self-Objectification and Social Anxiety in Adolescent Girls: The Mediating Role of Self-Worth and Concern About Body Image*

Thank you once again for your time and consideration. We look forward to your further feedback.
Yours sincerely,

Reviewer 1:

The authors have addressed virtually all comments and well done.

Reply to Reviewers: Thank you for your kind feedback and support. We appreciate your acknowledgment of our efforts in addressing the comments thoroughly.

Reviewer 2:

Your revisions have significantly enhanced the overall quality of the work. The clarity and depth of your analysis are much improved, and the changes you implemented reflect a thoughtful consideration of the feedback... However, I would like to point out a minor issue regarding the statistical analysis section. The procedure and data analysis steps appear repeated twice, which may confuse readers. I recommend revising this section to ensure clarity and conciseness.

Reply to Reviewers: Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript. We have carefully considered your feedback and made the necessary revisions accordingly... In particular, we have revised the methods section to clarify **PROCEDURE**, and we have added a ***DATA ANALYSIS*** to address reviewer's concern about mediation effect. We believe that these changes have significantly improved the quality of our paper.

Associate Editor 1:

Thank you for your attention and correcting the manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers, your revised manuscript has been reviewed by the reviewers, Currently, your manuscript needs minor revision, according to the reviewer's opinion, and also this version still needs reference writing editing (for reference writing, use Endnote software - note: in your current manuscript, reference 21 comes before reference 17).

Reply to Reviewers: We have carefully considered your comments and as you suggested, we have formatted all references using **ZOTERO**, ensuring consistency and adherence to the journal's guidelines.

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 14 Oct 2024 – 16 Mar 2025

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 14 Oct 2024

Dear Authors,

Thank you for addressing the previous comment on the statistical analysis section. The revision has improved clarity by removing the repetitive steps, making the methodology more concise and easier to understand. From a methodological viewpoint, the manuscript is now suitable for publication.

Best regards,

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 6 Mar 2025

Thank you for your attention and for correcting the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. Your revised manuscript has been reviewed by the reviewers. The current version of your manuscript is suitable for publication.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Mar 2025

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized with your cooperation in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.