




## Ranking Cognitive–Affective Factors in the Development of Psychosomatic Illness




Giselle. Mata<sup>1</sup>, Diana. Rodrigues da Silva<sup>2</sup>, Beatriz. Peixoto<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Centre in Education (CIE-ISPA), ISPA—Instituto Universitário de Ciências Psicológicas, Sociais e da Vida, 1149-041 Lisbon, Portugal

<sup>2</sup> Insight - Piaget Research Center for Human and Ecological Development, Escola Higher de Education Jean Piaget, Almada, Portugal

<sup>3</sup> Department of Education and Training of Professors, Viana do Castelo, Portugal

\* Corresponding author email address: beatrizpeixoto@ipvc.pt

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Bahram Jowkar  Professor of Psychology Department, Shiraz University, Iran jowkar@shirazu.ac.ir	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Sumaira Ayub  Department of Applied Psychology, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.sumaira.ayub@umt.edu.pk <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Majid Yousefi Afrashteh  Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, Zanjan University, Zanjan, Iran.yousefi@znu.ac.ir

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “Psychosomatic illness represents one of the most complex intersections between mind and body...” is strong rhetorically but would benefit from a brief operational definition of “psychosomatic illness” as used in this study to enhance conceptual precision.

The claim “Cultural and contextual factors exert additional influence on psychosomatic expression” is important but underdeveloped. Consider adding a brief contrast between Western and non-Western psychosomatic patterns or cultural emotion regulation norms to enrich cross-cultural interpretation.

The statement “limited research has systematically ranked the relative importance of these cognitive–affective factors” is well-placed. However, to highlight the study’s originality, the authors should briefly note whether similar ranking studies exist in psychosomatic or clinical health psychology literature (if not, cite the absence).

The authors conclude that “emotional dysregulation was perceived as the most influential determinant.” This is consistent with prior studies, but it would be useful to discuss why participants might perceive emotional dysregulation more saliently than cognitive factors—perhaps due to cultural or experiential salience.

The statement “the ranking approach did not account for potential interaction effects among factors” is commendably reflective. However, it would be useful to suggest specific analytical models (e.g., SEM, path analysis) that could address these interdependencies in future studies.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## *1.2. Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

In “Individuals with low emotional awareness or poor regulation capacities often redirect unprocessed affect into physical sensations...” — please clarify whether this assertion is drawn from empirical or theoretical sources, and ensure consistent citation (e.g., specify which cited study supports this mechanism).

The text mentions “hyperactivation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis”—it would strengthen the neurobiological rigor to add a reference to a recent psychoneuroimmunology study (2023–2025) confirming this link in psychosomatic populations.

The sentence “chronic exposure to stress triggers overactivation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis...” should be linked more explicitly to empirical references within the same paragraph, rather than relying on earlier citations, to strengthen internal coherence.

In “the ranking also placed relational and attachment factors as the fourth most influential determinant...” — this section could benefit from integrating a theoretical model (e.g., Bowlby’s attachment framework or affect regulation theory) to give more conceptual depth.

The authors discuss personality traits but should clarify whether the questionnaire measured these traits directly or if this ranking is based solely on participants’ perceptions. This distinction is crucial for interpretative validity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## **2. Revised**

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.