




Comparison of the Effectiveness of Parenting-Based Identity Formation Training and Positive Youth Development Training on Social Interaction Quality and Gender Schemas in Adolescent Girls

Maryam. Tabandeh¹, Ali. Mahdad^{1*}, Ilnaz. Sajjadian¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.

* Corresponding author email address: amahdad@khuif.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Muhammad Rizwan  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk	Reviewer 1: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Seyed Ali Darbani  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The section describing “Theories of identity development” effectively integrates psychosocial and neurodevelopmental views, but it would be more cohesive if the authors briefly clarified how these frameworks specifically justify the inclusion of parenting-based versus positive youth development (PYD) approaches. Adding a bridging sentence explaining the theoretical rationale behind comparing these two interventions would enhance logical continuity.

The discussion of the PYD framework and its “Five Cs” is strong but could include a short comparison between PYD’s asset-based logic and deficit-reduction models in adolescent psychology. This would underline the innovative aspect of the intervention.

The authors correctly interpret the main effects but could better separate statistical significance from practical significance. For instance, clarifying whether changes in mean SIQ scores exceed clinically meaningful thresholds would contextualize the results.

The explanation attributing superior results to “direct engagement of familial and cognitive schema processes” is persuasive but speculative. The paper would benefit from citing empirical comparisons or mediation analyses supporting this causal interpretation.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The phrase “Parental influence plays an especially critical role...” correctly identifies the family context, yet the paragraph would benefit from citing empirical meta-analytic evidence or cross-cultural data supporting these associations, particularly to contextualize findings within Iranian sociocultural norms.

When the authors write “Gender schema development represents another essential dimension of adolescent identity”, they should more clearly operationalize how “gender schema” is defined for the purpose of this study. A brief conceptual definition—cognitive structures shaping gendered information processing—should precede the literature discussion to aid readers unfamiliar with the term.

The sentence “Despite the positive influence of developmental interventions, contemporary adolescents face unique challenges in forming coherent identities due to the digitalization of social life” introduces an important variable (digital context) but leaves it theoretically disconnected from the intervention. The authors might clarify whether and how digital influences were considered or controlled in the present design.

The concluding paragraph summarizes the research purpose but lacks explicit hypotheses. It is recommended to specify two or three clear, testable hypotheses (e.g., “H1: Parenting-based identity formation training will produce greater improvement in social interaction quality than PYD training”) to guide the reader and align with the quantitative analyses.

The statement “for the variable gender schemas... only the parenting-based identity formation training group showed a statistically significant effect” should be accompanied by descriptive effect size differences and possibly confidence intervals to support this assertion.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.