




Parental Overcontrol and Adolescent Risk-Taking: The Mediating Role of Peer Conformity




Intan. Sari¹, Arjun. Deshmukh^{2*}, Haruka. Nishimura³

¹ Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

² Department of Psychology and Counseling, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India

³ Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan

* Corresponding author email address: arjun.deshmukh@unipune.ac.in

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
José Aparecido Da Silva  Full Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Sao Paulo, Ribeirao Preto, Sao Paulo, Brazil jadsilva@ffclrp.usp.br	Reviewer 1: Taher Tizdast  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: taher.tizdast@toniau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Meysam Sadeghi  Assistant Professor of Department of Cognitive Psychology, Higher Education Institute of Cognitive Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: m.sadeghi@icss.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Although parental overcontrol and peer conformity have each been independently linked to adolescent risk-taking...” makes a strong claim. It would be useful to cite meta-analytic or longitudinal studies to reinforce the causal implication.

The total effect of parental overcontrol ($\beta = 0.48$) is substantial. However, the manuscript would benefit from a short discussion comparing direct vs. indirect pathways, especially regarding effect size interpretation.

The claim “overcontrolled adolescents often attempt to reclaim autonomy through behaviors that explicitly defy adult authority...” could be better supported by citing cross-cultural psychological research, especially in collectivist contexts.

Digital peer influence is only mentioned briefly. The authors could elaborate more on how digital conformity was not measured in the current study but remains a potential confounder.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The authors mention “Given these multidimensional dynamics...” without summarizing the prior theoretical gaps. Consider briefly stating the unique contribution of your mediational model here.

The statistical assumptions are well-reported. However, the authors should report skewness and kurtosis numeric values directly rather than only stating ranges.

The sentence “Peer conformity, therefore, functions as a gateway...” is conceptually strong but somewhat metaphorical. Consider rephrasing with clearer academic terminology (e.g., mediational conduit, transmission mechanism).

The neurobiological discussion is insightful. However, linking these findings more directly to the current SEM results (e.g., how neural sensitivity aligns with β values) would enhance coherence.

The statement “These findings underscore the broad applicability of the conformity construct...” is compelling. However, more caution is needed in generalizing to “all adolescent behavioral tendencies” given the specificity of the current sample and measures.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.