

## Examining the Relationship Between Emotion Regulation Difficulties and Marital Burnout With the Mediating Role of Intimacy Styles in Couples Applying for Divorce

Toktam. Tayebi<sup>1</sup>, Hamidreza. Vatankhah<sup>2\*</sup>, Hooshang. Jadidi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, WT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Sa.C., Islamic Azad University, Kurdistan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: ham\_vatankhah@yahoo.com

### Editor

Shahram Vahedi  
Professor, Department of  
Educational Psychology, Faculty of  
Educational Sciences and  
Psychology, Tabriz University,  
Tabriz, Iran  
vahedi117@yahoo.com

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Parvaneh Mohammadkhani  
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences  
and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Abolghasem Khoshkanesh  
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,  
Iran.  
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the statement “marriage constitutes one of the most fundamental and complex interpersonal institutions”, the authors introduce an important concept but do not anchor it in any major theoretical framework of marital functioning. Briefly situating this claim within a recognized theory (e.g., systems or attachment theory) would enhance scholarly rigor.

The manuscript defines marital burnout comprehensively; however, it does not clarify whether burnout is conceptualized as a stable trait or a fluctuating state. This distinction is essential for interpreting the causal implications of the structural model.

The claim “emotion regulation has emerged as one of the most influential psychological determinants of marital health” is strong and requires specification of whether this influence is theoretical, empirical, or both.

While the multidimensional nature of intimacy is listed (emotional, psychological, sexual, etc.), the manuscript does not explain why these dimensions are theoretically distinct. A brief conceptual differentiation would strengthen construct clarity.

While univariate normality is assessed, the manuscript does not address multivariate normality, which is critical for structural equation modeling assumptions.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement “emotion regulation and intimacy are not independent processes” would benefit from referencing an explicit theoretical model that supports this interaction to improve conceptual grounding.

Although the research gap is stated, the manuscript should more clearly articulate how the present model advances knowledge beyond existing frameworks and why previous models were insufficient.

The manuscript references item deletions from the original scale development but does not clarify whether the same item structure was used in this study. This should be explicitly stated.

Although the scale dimensions are described, internal consistency coefficients for each subscale are not reported for the present sample. This information is necessary for evaluating measurement reliability.

Only total-scale Cronbach’s alpha values are reported. Given the multidimensional nature of emotion regulation and intimacy, subscale reliability coefficients should also be provided.

The extremely small standard deviation for emotion regulation ( $SD = 0.070$ ) is atypical for psychological data. The authors should verify this value and discuss potential range restriction effects.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.