**Reply to reviewers.**

We want to thank the academic editor and reviewers for their insightful comments, which helped improve the paper. Following please find a detailed explanation:

**R -** Represents the reviewer comments.

**A -** Represents the authors' answers.

**Reviewer 1**

**Issue 1**

**R** - I think the paper needs to be rebalanced between the literature review and the presentation and exploration of the "new model" which is in fact a combination of two existing models.

1. Thank you very much for the comment. We have expanded the parts related to the presentation and exploration of the model, as can be seen in lines 306-, and in the new parts added, concerning the possible applications and implications of the model, \_lines \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. We believe that the paper is more balanced in its revised version and this change improved the quality of the paper.

**Issue 2**

**R** - It might be a bit of an over-statement to claim to have produced a new model and it might be better to rethink this.

**A-**Thank you very much for the comment. We agree that while the proposed model integrates existing knowledge embedded in existing models, the current model integrates existing knowledge embedded in existing models. It also presents a novel perspective, which indicates the centricity of potency and social resources as key resources that dictate the emotional responses and behaviors of bystanders. This allows for novel applications in mitigation of the adverse impacts following witnessing mistreatment, especially among adolescents, as informed by similar contexts. Previous findings of studies among adolescents-at-risk indicate that strengthening potency, especially the two factors of belief in a just society and social support, serve as a buffer against deterioration into drug use. No previous model describes the triggers of the emotional and behavioral responses of bystanders as victims by proxy. By doing so, the proposed model addresses the notion raised in Paull et al. emphasizing that effective prevention and intervention strategies should recognize bystanders’ multiple roles.

Aside from the typology of Paull et al., existing models focus on explaining the phenomenon of witnessing bullying in work settings. In contrast, the current model is designed to explain bystanders who are adolescents. Despite their commonalities, it seems that being a bystander elicits higher levels of distress and greater emotional impact on adolescents than on adult employees. Thus, a separate model is needed to account for the process and its implications among adolescents. Moreover, other models utilize various antecedents to explain bystanders’ reactions, some of which are explanatory variables focusing on traits of the situation, such as the time course of the act. Thus, despite their explanatory contribution, they contribute less to mitigation. Using Conservation of Resources (COR) theory as a framework to explain bystanders’ reactions to bullying can mitigate adverse impacts, since the resources that are key features in the current model can be enhanced.

Additionally, while classic models completely overlook the recurrent nature of bullying, current enlightening models account for the dynamic nature of witnessing an act of bullying, and its implications. However, even they fail to take a broad perspective that extends beyond the dyadic or triadic equation of a certain recurrent act. The proposed model is in line with findings demonstrating that the passive experience of bystanders’ victimization increases their likelihood for future observation of separate incidents. This finding is also supported by other theoretical models that explain violation of psychological contracts. The work of Salin and Notelaers, for example, shows that being a bystander to bullying can be seen as a violation of a psychological contract. In summary, looking at these processes from a COR perspective enables the development of a dynamic view of bystanding, present and future implications beyond recurrent triadic interplay, a comprehensive view of the phenomenon, and directions for mitigation of risk and health risk behaviors.

We thank you for the insightful comment that helped us to specify our claim, and simultaneously integrate your comment concerning the utilization of features embedded in existing models.

**Issue 3**

**R** - Also, while the model is presented well, there is no test of the model, so the paper remains purely at a conceptual level and I think this needs to be named in the paper and the need for empirical testing of the combined model should be highlighted.

1. Thank you very much for the comment. We highlighted the conceptual nature of the paper in the abstract line 27 and in our recommendations for future research that were added in lines\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Issue 4**

**R** - The discussion is too short and leaves the reader with too many questions - I had expected this part of the paper to talk more about the application of the model.

1. Thank you very much for this comment. We added an additional part concerning possible applications and implications of the model for research and practice, as can be seen in lines\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer 2**

**Issue 1**

**R-** The proposed "comprehensive behavior model" is based on applying resources conservation principle to the broad data known from literature. However, each model requires verifying on some real data. Was any data collected during this research? Can you describe any procedure how this verification can be performed?

1. We thank the reviewer for this significant comment. We have highlighted the notion that this is a conceptual theoretical model in the abstract, line\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ , and in the added section concerning implications and the need of its validation in future research. Additionally, we supported the need to address the components embedded in the current model, both theoretically and empirically, as utilized in different research applications.

**Issue 2**

1. In Section 3 does not provide a significant contribution and just reports a number of weakly grounded statements. In other words, the paper simply does not contain *enough research* to be a *research* article. I recommend changing the type of article to review paper with some "generalized model" supplementary section.
2. Thank you for this comment. We have highlighted the conceptual nature of the paper and the need for validating it through empirical research. We agree that it can be regarded as a conceptual paper that presents a wider perspective on the overall concept of bystanding and should foster follow up research, to develop and validate mechanisms that can help mitigating risk and health behaviors as presented in lines\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. As this is the first model to suggest an integrative viewpoint integrating risk and health behaviors, to reflect the victim by proxy role of the bystander, we agree it needs validation, but feel it presents an interesting view on the victimization process experienced by bystanders.

**Reviewer 3**

There were no comments.

**Reviewer 4**

**Issue 1**

1. Abstract: Keywords should be shown according to the order of reading such words. Please, reorder them as drafted in the abstract. I suggest you also show 6-8 keywords involved in the abstract.
2. Thank you for the comment. Keywords in lines 24-25 have been reordered according to the order of reading and additional keywords were added as suggested.

**Issue 2**

**R**-**Introduction**: Lines 38-39: When you state “the underlying assumption of this research approach is that, in the act of bullying, bystanders are passively victimized”, I strongly would suggest that you explain this statement more clearly since this assumption seems a key issue in your research.

Lines 40-41: When you say, “Other researchers have adopted a different perspective, noting that bystanders are not merely victims by proxy”, it seems a bold statement and should be done very carefully. Thus, I encourage you to explain more widely why it can become a different approach compared with others.

Lines 112-113: When you say that “Unlike its predecessors, the model takes account of feelings and the dynamicity of behaviors over time”, you should explain much better what you want to state from further trusted sources based on your choice.

1. We agree with this comment. Indeed, the victimization of bystanders embedded in this model should be highlighted and your recommendation concerning lines 38-39 is appreciated and addressed in lines 43-60, in which an extended explanation was added.

* We appreciate the comment, and rethinking the terminology used, we changed the terminology and now consider it as a wider view, as can be seen in line 61- 62 and \_\_\_. We believe that now our contribution is highlighted more accurately, as it relies on the fact that no previous models have explained the process and underlying factors of bystanders’ self-risk and health behaviors. Relying on resources and COR as a framework captures central antecedents that point to effective intervention programs, which are also supported empirically.
* The dynamicity of appraisal emotions and behaviours over time was elaborated in lines 134-152.

**Issue 3**

R-**The Framework of the Proposed Model:**Lines 115-116: When you say that “Conservation of resources (COR) theory has been used as a theoretical framework”, there is a lack of further explanation. Please justify your election by comparing it with other possible theories. The use of a comparative table may hep helpful.

Lines 166-167: When you state “We suggest that bystanders may use some of these mechanisms to justify their reactions toward the victim and perpetrator, and their self-risk and health risk behaviors in connection with their inventory of resources”, you should support this hypothesis, as it seems a fundamental basis of your model. To be honest, I really don’t see the basis of your statement at this point.

Lines 234-235: When you state that “However, we believe that low resources (i.e., potency) are not sufficient to explain the willingness to help the perpetrator and to overlook the feelings and overall experience of the victim”,   I strongly would suggest that you explain this idea more clearly since this assertion seems a key issue in your research.

Line 236: When you say that “We emphasize that the use of MD is also necessary”, you should be more precise regarding the perspectives here concerned.

**A** This is an excellent idea that also helped us fine-tune our argument.

* A table was added, which shows current frameworks, and their advantages and disadvantages compared to COR.
* We further explained this notion and supported it through previous papers, as can be seen in lines 222 – 225.
* The comments related to lines 166-167 and lines 234- 235 are connected. Prior to the presentation of the model in lines 166-167, an extended and supported explanation was added, and in lines 234-235 and 236, it was thoroughly addressed.

**Issue 4**

R-  Health and Risk Behaviors of Bystanders in the Framework of COR and Moral Disengagement: Lines 266-267: When you state that “Various studies have found a link between bullying behaviors and substance use among adolescents”, I struggled a lot understanding what you have stated here, as only two references have been here cited. It seems that the argument is not sufficiently convincing here.

1. We have added few supporting studies and rephrased the claim to be more accurate.

**Issue 5**

1. Discussion: Please include some additional clarification concerning the discussion on your proposed model.
2. Please see lines \_\_\_\_\_. We believe that the discussion is more elaborative now.

**Issue 6**

1. Conclusion: Please include comments summarizing your ideas regarding both findings and results from your study, as this is a fundamental part of any paper.
2. We have concluded

**Issue 7**

1. Future Directions and Research Limitations: Please include a specific subsection in that regard beyond a brief sentence (lines 327-328) on this matter, as it can help future researchers interested in applying the proposed theoretical model provided in your manuscript.

A-