

Discovery of Factors Influencing Marital Dissatisfaction in Spouses of Military Personnel

Mohammad Mahdi. Eftekhari¹, Fatemeh. Shirvani^{1*}, Zahra. Fathi Kilisani², Rahelleh. Mosayeb Khozani¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Kho.C., Islamic Azad University, Khomeinishahr, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Ferdowsi University, Mashhad, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fatemeh.shirvani3084@iau.ir

Editor

Manijeh Daneshpour

Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University, California, United States of America
mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

Reviewers

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 claim that military families are “one of the most psychologically burdened groups” would benefit from an explicit comparative frame. Please clarify relative to whom (e.g., civilian families, first responders, refugee families).

The paragraph beginning “Beyond individual and relational processes...” introduces stigma and access barriers but does not integrate these concepts into the study’s later thematic framework. Please explicitly map how these constructs correspond to the final global themes.

The research gap is implied but not explicitly articulated. Please add a concise problem statement before the sentence: “Therefore, the aim of the present study is...” that clearly identifies the unresolved scholarly issue.

The phrase “This pattern is well documented” should be followed by a brief synthesis of what is documented (e.g., emotional distance, role conflict, attachment disruption).

Please explicitly restate how your qualitative model advances theory beyond existing frameworks, rather than only confirming prior findings.

The limitation regarding self-report bias should also acknowledge potential interviewer effects and cultural norms influencing disclosure.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The sentence “Participants included 12 spouses...” requires justification for sample adequacy. Please explicitly explain how thematic saturation was assessed and provide at least one criterion used to determine saturation.

The interview protocol lists two sample questions only. Please clarify whether these were the core guiding questions or illustrative examples, and provide the number of total interview prompts used.

The statement “validation was conducted using the four criteria proposed by Guba and Lincoln” lacks methodological transparency. Please specify how each criterion (credibility, dependability, confirmability, transferability) was operationalized.

The transformation from 50 basic themes to 11 organizing themes requires methodological explanation. Please add a brief analytic narrative describing the coding reduction process.

In subsection “Fatigue from marital and family responsibilities,” the causal language implies linearity. Please clarify that the findings represent perceived associations, not causal relationships.

The sentence “Participants consistently described emotional unavailability...” should include at least one direct participant quotation to strengthen qualitative validity.

The theme “Change in public attitudes following the ‘Woman, Life, Freedom’ movement” introduces socio-political context without clarifying how participants referenced this phenomenon. Please provide an example of narrative evidence.

The integration with prior literature is strong; however, the manuscript would benefit from a brief contrasting interpretation explaining why some spouses may remain resilient despite similar stressors.

The discussion of caregiving identity transformation would be strengthened by referencing identity theory or role strain theory to anchor interpretation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.