

The Relationship Between Mindfulness and Social Anxiety with the Mediating Role of Metacognitive Beliefs in Mothers of Children with Autism and Intellectual Disability

Fatemeh Soghra. Sina^{1*}

¹ Department of Educational Management, Nek.C., Islamic Azad University, Neka, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fa.sina@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Seyyed Mohsen Asgharinekah
Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
asghari-n@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Masoud Asadi
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran.
Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening paragraph provides a strong general definition of social anxiety, but it would be strengthened by explicitly positioning social anxiety understanding within a metacognitive framework earlier, rather than introducing metacognition only later in the section.

In the paragraph beginning “Mothers of children with autism and intellectual disability face unique and persistent challenges...”, the manuscript would benefit from briefly clarifying why mothers (not caregivers in general) were selected as the focal population.

The discussion of metacognitive beliefs is theoretically rich; however, the manuscript does not clearly distinguish metacognitive beliefs from core cognitive distortions. A short clarifying sentence would improve conceptual precision.

The manuscript states that data were non-normal and that nonparametric tests were applied, yet PLS-SEM (which does not require normality) was also used. The authors should explicitly explain this dual analytic logic.

In Table 2, significance levels are reported as less than 0.05, indicating non-normality; however, later analyses still include parametric-style interpretations. This inconsistency should be addressed explicitly.

Figure 1 is titled “Conceptual Visualization of the Multimodal Deep Learning Framework for Detecting Anxiety and Perfectionism Patterns”, which is conceptually unrelated to the current study. This appears to be an error and must be corrected immediately.

While Fornell–Larcker criteria are reported in Table 4, the manuscript does not mention HTMT ratios, which are now standard in PLS-SEM reporting. The authors should justify their omission or include them.

In Table 6, both Sobel test and PLS path coefficients are reported. The authors should clarify why Sobel testing was used, given that bootstrapping is typically sufficient in PLS-SEM mediation analysis.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

While mindfulness is well-defined, the manuscript should clarify which facet model (e.g., five-facet model) is theoretically most relevant to social anxiety, rather than treating mindfulness as a unidimensional construct.

The paragraph asserting that mindfulness modifies metacognitive beliefs would benefit from a clear causal logic chain, explicitly explaining how mindfulness leads to changes in beliefs before influencing anxiety.

In the paragraph beginning “Despite the growing literature...”, the research gaps are well-identified, but the authors should more explicitly state why a mediational SEM model is theoretically necessary, not merely methodologically novel.

The sentence “a sample of 237 participants was selected using convenience sampling” requires justification regarding potential selection bias and how it may influence external validity.

In the Metacognitive Beliefs section, reliability indices are extensively reported; however, the authors should clarify whether all five subscales were modeled separately or as a single latent construct in the SEM.

There is an apparent inconsistency regarding cutoff scores (15, 40, 50) reported for the social anxiety questionnaire. The authors should clarify which cutoff, if any, was relevant to this study, or explain why cutoffs were discussed at all in a correlational design.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.