



# The Effectiveness of a Body Image Intervention on Self-Acceptance and Disordered Eating Attitudes

Arjun. Deshmukh<sup>1</sup> , Neha. Sharma<sup>2\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology and Counseling, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India

<sup>2</sup> Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

\* Corresponding author email address: neha.sharma@psych.du.ac.in

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Salahadin Lotfi  PhD in Cognitive Psychology & Neuroscience, UWM & Rogers Behavioral Health Verified, Lecturer at University of Wisconsin slotfi@uwm.edu	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Zahra Yousefi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuif.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Abotaleb Saadati Shamir  Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, University of Science and Research, Tehran, Iran. Email: psychology@iau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The authors state, “Innovations in digital health have further expanded the accessibility...” but do not clarify how their intervention compares to or integrates digital formats. Given the increasing importance of online platforms, this distinction should be addressed.

The description of the Self-Acceptance Scale references its original development in 1952 but omits whether any adaptations or translations were used for the current Indian sample. Please clarify how cultural or linguistic validity was ensured.

The report notes “significant time × group interaction effects,” but lacks any mention of statistical power or sample size justification. Including a priori power analysis would strengthen the validity of the statistical claims.

The authors claim that “...self-acceptance-centered approaches can mitigate negative self-perception...” without referencing the specific mechanisms of change (e.g., emotion regulation, cognitive restructuring). This should be elaborated using a theoretical lens.

The authors mention “differential outcomes among participants based on baseline levels...” but no subgroup analysis is reported. Consider whether a median split or exploratory moderation analysis could support this claim.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement “This study addresses the aforementioned gaps...” would benefit from clearer articulation of the specific theoretical or empirical gaps being filled, particularly distinguishing this study from past interventions using similar CBT and self-compassion approaches.

The sentence “Participants were screened for eligibility using a brief demographic and health questionnaire.” lacks detail on exclusion criteria beyond concurrent psychological treatment. Were individuals with current or past eating disorder diagnoses, or with BMI outside a certain range, excluded?

The authors note, “Total scores above 20 are typically indicative of potentially problematic eating attitudes.” It would strengthen validity to mention how many participants in the sample exceeded this threshold at pre-test and post-test.

The authors report self-reported BMI but do not discuss its possible inaccuracies. A brief discussion on the potential bias of self-reported weight/height would add methodological rigor.

The authors assert, “...reduced endorsement of rigid food rules, body-related guilt...” without presenting subscale-level EAT-26 data. Disaggregating findings by subscale could offer more granular insights into which domains were most affected.

The sentence “The role of self-acceptance as a mediating or moderating influence...” introduces a mediation hypothesis that is not statistically tested. This should be clearly noted as speculative, and future research directions should propose a formal test.

The comment “...group setting may have fostered a sense of shared experience...” is valuable but should be substantiated with references to group therapy literature on body image. Consider citing empirical studies supporting this claim.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.