






The Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing on Emotional Regulation Components in Women with Eating Disorders

Seyedeh Parisa. Moosavi¹, Azadeh. Askari^{2*}

¹ M.A., Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: askari_27@yahoo.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mohsen Joshanloo  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Keimyung University, 1095 Dalgubeol Boulevard, Dalseo-Gu, Daegu 42601, South Korea mohsen.joshanloo@unimelb.edu.au	Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sentence “Motivational interviewing... has gained increasing attention...” should be supported with more empirical evidence regarding MI’s effectiveness in eating disorder populations specifically, rather than general psychological disorders.

“Despite these promising developments, research... remains limited.” This claim should be better substantiated by citing the lack of empirical trials or meta-analyses specific to MI and cognitive emotion regulation in eating disorders.

The scoring methodology for adaptive and maladaptive strategies lacks a citation. Please provide a source or validation study confirming the division by 10 and 8, respectively.

The intervention protocol based on Abdolhosseini et al. (2016) is well-structured, but you should briefly justify why this model was selected over other MI protocols with empirical backing in eating disorders.

The text mentions both ANCOVA and MANCOVA but does not specify which subscales were analyzed under each. Please clarify how multivariate assumptions were met and how variables were grouped.

The reported increase in acceptance in the control group (13.27 to 13.47) versus a decrease in the experimental group (13.6 to 9.02) is counterintuitive. This result requires explanation, as it may suggest an anomaly or misinterpretation of the construct.

The statement “acceptance declined slightly (likely reflecting a recalibration effect)” is speculative. Please either provide a theoretical basis for this explanation or refrain from conjecture.

Please include a note on how multicollinearity between subscales was ruled out or handled, given the overlapping nature of cognitive emotion regulation strategies.

The authors assert that “the marked improvement in emotional regulation... supports the efficacy of motivational interviewing.” While accurate, please moderate the causal inference by emphasizing the quasi-experimental nature of the study.

The references to previous findings (e.g., HosseiniTavan et al., 2023) are well-integrated, but the discussion could benefit from differentiating between MI’s effects in chronic physical illness and psychological disorders.

The authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly stated, the justification for choosing a sample size of 30 is missing. Please include a power analysis or rationale for this decision.

The text discusses the Maslow Psychological Security Inventory, yet the title of the study does not indicate “psychological security” as a variable. Please clarify if this was a primary, secondary, or exploratory variable.

“The improvements observed... are also in accordance with research that connects MI to enhanced psychological resilience...” — please define or operationalize “psychological resilience” and explain how it was inferred from the current study's variables.

“MI’s empathic, nonjudgmental stance...” is an important point. Consider discussing the therapeutic alliance more explicitly and how it might mediate the observed outcomes.

You note that MI “appears to build emotional competencies...” — this needs clarification. Which specific competencies were measured or inferred from the CERQ?

The authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.