**REVISION RESPONSE**

**The Relationships between Iranian and Swedish Adolescents’ Personality Traits, Subjective Well-Being and Psychological Well-Being.**

Dear Dr. Timothy Moss,

First of all, we would like to thank you and both reviewers for your suggestions and comments. We appreciated them all and have followed each one of them. The manuscript was substantially improved, is more scholarly and easier to read thanks to the suggestions. In addition to yours and the reviewers’ comments we decided to avoid most of the abbreviations to improve readability and changed the title to more accurately highlight the main questions addressed and to be more straightforward. The new title is: “Iranian and Swedish Adolescents: Differences in Personality Traits and Well-Being”. Please see our responses below.
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**Editor’s Comments**

We have addressed the Editor’s concerns in the following way:

*Please consider reviewers’ comments concerning the formatting and reporting of statistics.*

As suggested we made the tables smaller to properly fit the pages as well as for tables 3 and 5 we adapted the ‘\*-system’ to indicate significance.

*Sampling issues need to be addressed – how were schools/participants chosen?*

In the Participants and procedure section we added the following information:

“The sampling procedure of schools was based on convenience and included the entire schools; although they had no particular interest or knowledge about our research interest beforehand. page 6, § 2, lines 11-13).

*The extent of the generalisability of the findings from a reasonable small sample needs to be considered as a potential limitation.*

In the Limitation section we added:

**“**Further, considering the rather small size of both samples, cautiousness in generalizing the results is warranted as well as acknowledging the need for replicating the core purposes of the study.” (page 16, §2, lines 9-11). Please see also next comment.

*Also related to sample size: Either a formal power analysis, or another justification of the sample size as being appropriate, should be included*

As suggested, we report the Observed Power for each of the MANOVAs and ANOVAS conducted. Please see the analyses on pages 9-10. Moreover we have added the following to the Limitation section:

“Further, considering the rather small size of both samples, cautiousness in generalizing the results is warranted as well as acknowledging the need for replicating the core purposes of the study. Nevertheless, with the exception of the differences between the samples in purpose in life and psychological well-being total score, the Observed Power was between .84-1.00—an Observed Power of .80 is generally considered acceptable (Cohen, 1988).” (page 16, §2, lines 9-14).

*Please address one reviewer’s concerns around the theoretical distinctions between the Big Five (Lexical model) vs Five Factor Model*

We agree with this point and addressed it by taking out the mentioning of the Five Factor Model and *only* refer to it, as suggested by the reviewer, as the Big Five Inventory:

“In the present study, personality traits are operationalized employing the Big Five Inventory (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). This is a valid and reliable instrument measuring five dimensions: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Openness (for a review see, John et al., 2008).” (page 4, §2, lines 8-11).

In order to keep the article focused we believe that a discussion around the differences is somewhat outside the scope of the article. However, we added more information about the differences between subjective well-being and psychological well-being (see our response to the reviewer).

*It is also important to include in this paper details of good ethical practice. Please indicate how informed consent, right to withdraw, protection from harm, etc. were ensured, and further indicate where this was scrutinised prior to data collection. This is particularly important given the age of the samples*

In the procedure we added the following two sentences:

“Teachers and parents were informed about the nature of the study and that participation was voluntary and that pupils had the right to withdraw at any moment. The school nurse from each school was contacted by the researchers and informed about the study in case any of the students needed counseling.” (page 6, § 2, lines 13-16).

AND

“The Ethics Committee of Gothenburg University approved this research protocol and written informed consent was obtained from all the participants.” (page 6, § 2, lines 22-23).

*Finally, it is desirable that the data for this study are made available in a publicly accessible archive – for example,* [*http://data-archive.ac.uk/*](http://data-archive.ac.uk/) *in the UK, although many other alternatives exist.*

 We want to thank the editor for his suggestion. We will see to make the data accessible in the best possible way. We will also opt to made the review open.

**Reviewer 1**

The reviewer found our article as well-written with relevant literature review and to contribute to cross-cultural (comparative) studies among adolescents in general and well-being in particular. Although we have already addressed each of the reviewers’ comments under the comments highlighted by the editor, we would like to thank the reviewer for the effort put in the constructive review.

**Reviewer 2**

The reviewer found the existence of two culturally different samples (Iranian and Swedish), to bring significant clarifications to understanding the relationship between personality and well-being across cultures. We want to thank the reviewer for her/his important comments. The specific comments from Reviewer 2, which has not been discussed above, we addressed as follow:

*First, the literature review is clear, but I think that the authors should integrate summary ideas related to the theoretical conceptualization of the five personality domains and SWB and PWB. Additionally, concerning personality measures, the authors should distinguish the Big Five (lexical tradition) and Five Factor Model; in the present study they use The Big Five Inventory. Although research has revealed relevant similitude between these two measures of personality, they are not the same thing. Moreover, it is important to explain the most important differences between the two well-being concepts.*

Regarding the well-being distinction we added the following information in the Introduction:

“Although both approaches can be seen to reflect Western cultures (e.g., Christopher, 1999); the two different ways to measure well-being differ in that the psychological well-being approach consist of predefined criteria (i.e., the 6 dimensions) meanwhile the subjective well-being approach is comparatively more ‘open’ in allowing the respondents to decide the criteria for themselves (although within the predefined criteria of satisfaction). Psychological well-being is often theorized to promote subjective well-being (Ryan & Deci 2001).” (page 3, § 2, lines 20-26).

*It seems to me that the authors conducted the adequate statistical procedures, although in the presentation a distinction between descriptive and inferential statistics would allow a better reading of the data. The use of Baron and Kenny mediation model is one of the possible procedures and is acceptable. Sobel test was conducted. Concerning figure 1 and the graphics of the results, if the authors used the AMOS program these graphical presentations would be automatic.*

We thank the reviewer for being explicit regarding the statistical methods we used.

*As the authors stated, the mediation analyses was not conducted in the Iranian sample since the number of subjects was not enough. Because of this we don’t ‘know if the mediation effect, an important aspect of the study, is similar to that of the Swedish sample.*

In regard to this comment we have tried to be explicit on why we could not address the mediation question in the Iranian sample in the Result section: “However, although Openness and Neuroticism predicted subjective well-being in the Iranian sample, neither of the traits predicted psychological well-being in this sample. Hence, mediation analyses could only be conducted for the Swedish sample.” (page 13, § 1, lines 3-6).

And in the Limitations section:

“Unfortunately the Iranian data set did not allow for the mediation analyses because the statistical criteria for such analyses put forward by Baron and Kenny (1986) were not met.” (page 17, § 1, lines 3-4).