




# Prioritizing Psychological Consequences of Online Peer Comparison: A Mixed-Methods Analysis Among Indonesian Youth




Bridget. Abalorio<sup>1</sup>, Intan. Sari<sup>2\*</sup>, Agus. Santoso<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Psychology, Peruvian University of Applied Sciences, Lima, Peru

<sup>2</sup> Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Department of Educational Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

\* Corresponding author email address: intan.sari@unpad.ac.id

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Trevor Archer  Professor Department of Psychology University of Gothenburg, Sweden trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Kamdin. Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence, “Empirical findings increasingly indicate that digital comparison processes evoke complex emotional states such as envy, anxiety, and diminished self-esteem...” merges results from different developmental stages. You should distinguish findings among adolescents versus young adults to preserve developmental specificity.

The manuscript states, “Adolescence ... is a particularly sensitive period during which peer feedback profoundly affects self-concept formation.”

The discussion of collectivist versus individualist orientations is compelling, yet the introduction omits any Indonesian cultural background. Insert a short contextual paragraph summarizing digital media penetration rates, collectivist tendencies, or family dynamics among Indonesian youth to justify the study site.

The phrase “systematic literature review of scholarly articles, dissertations, and theoretical reports...” is broad. Please specify inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g., databases, publication years, keywords) and whether PRISMA guidelines were followed. This enhances methodological rigor.

The paper notes “Participants were recruited through online academic and social media platforms using convenience sampling.”

The current description “Ranking of Psychological Consequences of Online Peer Comparison” lacks axis labels or numerical scale. Please provide axis titles (“Mean Rank” vs. “Themes”) and error bars if applicable. Figures should be self-explanatory without referring back to text.

The discussion asserts, “The identification of self-esteem depletion as the most prominent psychological effect aligns with the substantial body of evidence...”

The section on body image dissatisfaction could integrate more cross-gender comparisons and discuss the role of influencer culture. Currently, it relies on general statements; adding context-specific findings (e.g., Southeast Asian body ideal norms) would strengthen cultural interpretation.

In “These results expand on prior theoretical and empirical work by offering an integrated prioritization framework...” remind readers that causality cannot be inferred due to the cross-sectional nature of the quantitative phase. A one-sentence caution will preserve scientific accuracy.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph introducing Festinger’s social comparison theory is strong, but it should also mention upward and downward comparison dynamics in the digital context explicitly. Consider including extensions such as Vogel et al. (2014) or recent digital comparison models to enrich theoretical depth.

In “Network-based psychological models further explain that exposure to repeated comparative stimuli strengthens neural pathways associated with rumination and reward processing...” the claim about neural reinforcement lacks a cited neuroimaging study. Please add empirical support (e.g., fMRI or EEG findings) or rephrase to avoid overgeneralization.

When you write, “A structured questionnaire was developed based on the categories and subcategories identified in the qualitative phase,” provide more detail: Was face or content validity established through expert review? Including Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  for internal consistency would improve psychometric transparency.

The manuscript mentions “peer debriefing and iterative validation.” Add a brief explanation of how inter-coder agreement was calculated (e.g., Cohen’s  $\kappa$ ) or, if not, justify its absence to strengthen credibility.

Some subthemes under Theme 3: Anxiety and Distress (e.g., “Restlessness when offline; Feeling excluded; Anxiety before posting”) might overlap with Theme 7: Social Isolation. Consider refining operational distinctions between emotional tension and behavioral withdrawal for conceptual clarity.

Add the  $\chi^2$  statistic, degrees of freedom, and p-value below Table 2 for reproducibility. While these values are mentioned in text earlier, embedding them within the table ensures accessibility for readers.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.