





Body Dissatisfaction and Somatic Complaints: The Mediating Role of Self-Criticism

Ali. Aghaziarati^{1*} 

¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: ali_aghaziarati@edu.ui.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Andrés M. Pérez-Acosta  Observatory of Self-Medication Behavior, School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia andres.perez@urosario.edu.co	Reviewer 1: Mojtaba Karimi  Department of Clinical Psychology, Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran, Iran. Email: m_karimi98@atu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mahdi Zare Bahramabadi  Associate Professor, Research Institute for Research and Development of Humanities Samat, Tehran, Iran. zare@samat.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “This dissatisfaction is not merely a superficial concern but has been consistently linked to a host of mental and physical health outcomes...” could benefit from further specificity. Please briefly define or categorize these health outcomes to set a clearer foundation for the reader.

The sentence “These self-critical beliefs may exacerbate physical symptom reporting through heightened stress reactivity...” needs a more detailed linkage to existing psychosomatic or stress literature to bolster the theoretical foundation. In discussing “recent research suggests that sociocultural variables, such as classroom context and peer influences...”, it would strengthen the argument to include a brief elaboration on how peer feedback mechanisms (e.g., appearance teasing, social ranking) interact with self-perception.

The statement “supporting the initial hypotheses” is vague. It would be clearer to restate which specific hypotheses were supported (e.g., H1, H2, H3), especially for readers who skip directly to results.

While standardized (beta) and unstandardized (b) coefficients are given, confidence intervals are not reported. Please add 95% CIs to enhance statistical transparency.

The phrase “this study extends those findings by identifying self-criticism as a key psychological mechanism” is a strong claim. Consider tempering this by acknowledging the limitations of cross-sectional designs in establishing causal mechanisms.

The authors state “Although the current study did not examine moderating variables...” but should discuss why potentially relevant moderators (e.g., gender, media exposure) were excluded and suggest how they could be incorporated in future work.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The claim “somatic complaints... are frequently reported by adolescents and often co-occur with psychological distress” needs a more nuanced discussion. Consider including specific prevalence data or meta-analytic findings to establish the magnitude and significance of this issue.

In the sentence “Sociocultural pressures—including media representations, peer norms, and cultural standards—play a substantial role...”, please clarify the cultural context (e.g., Western vs. Eastern) of these pressures to avoid overgeneralization.

The sentence “suggesting that somatic symptoms were relatively prevalent in the sample” would be stronger if backed by a comparison to clinical cutoff scores or normative data for the CSI-24.

The claim “self-criticism appears to internalize dissatisfaction...” is slightly awkward in phrasing. Consider rewording to “self-criticism may serve as a cognitive mechanism that intensifies internalization of body-related dissatisfaction” for precision.

The sentence “This cycle has been observed across cultural settings” would benefit from clarifying whether the cited studies directly compared cultures or were conducted in non-Western contexts. Avoid implying cross-cultural generalizability without comparative evidence.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.