

Conceptual Framework of Healthy Divorce in Iran: A Qualitative Study

Samaneh. Amiri Siavashani¹, Hooman. Namvar^{2*}, Reza. Ghorban Jahromi³

¹ Department of Psychology, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Sav. C., Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran

³ Department of Educational Psychology and Personality, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Hooman.namvar@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Reviewers

Petronella Jonck

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa
petrojonck@hotmail.com

Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran.

Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Stephen C. L. Lau

Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States.

Email: lauc@wustl.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While the notion of “healthy divorce” is introduced effectively, the manuscript does not sufficiently distinguish this construct from related terms such as amicable divorce, low-conflict divorce, or constructive separation. A short conceptual differentiation would improve theoretical precision.

The paragraph beginning with “Psychological factors play a central role in shaping divorce experiences” synthesizes literature well, but it would be strengthened by explicitly stating why psychological variables are hypothesized to outweigh other dimensions in the Iranian context, rather than implying universality.

The paragraph describing Iran’s sociocultural context is informative, yet largely descriptive. The authors are encouraged to more explicitly link cultural norms (e.g., collectivism, family honor) to mechanisms influencing divorce processes, rather than treating them as background conditions.

The phrase “integrative approach based on documentary studies, the fuzzy Delphi method, and field interviews” would benefit from a clearer methodological justification explaining why this combination is epistemologically appropriate for theory building rather than variable testing.

The sentence “crime and delinquency—due to its weight being below the mean—was excluded” requires further justification, as criminal behavior may function as a threshold or qualitative disruptor rather than a linear predictor.

The figure is referenced but insufficiently explained in text. A paragraph explicitly walking the reader through the structure and flow of the model would improve interpretability and pedagogical value.

While the discussion appropriately restates findings, it would benefit from a stronger theory-building orientation, explicitly stating how the proposed model advances or revises existing divorce frameworks.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The manuscript states that experts were required to hold “at least associate professor” rank. The authors should justify this criterion, as it may exclude clinically experienced practitioners whose insights could be theoretically valuable despite lower academic rank.

The selection of “one individual from each couple” raises concerns about dyadic validity. The authors should acknowledge how individual-level narratives may diverge from couple-level dynamics and clarify how this limitation was addressed analytically.

The detailed psychometric discussion of the Emotional Expressiveness Questionnaire appears disproportionate for a primarily qualitative study. The authors should clarify the analytic role of this instrument within the broader qualitative design.

In the paragraph beginning “In the qualitative phase of the study, a literature review and content analysis were first conducted”, the coding process (open, axial, selective) is not clearly articulated. Explicit description of analytic steps would enhance methodological transparency.

The manuscript does not clearly explain why indicators with weights below the mean were excluded. The use of the mean as a cutoff criterion should be theoretically or methodologically justified, as this decision significantly shapes the final model.

The removal of infertility, disability, and obesity is statistically justified, yet conceptually sensitive in the Iranian context. The authors should discuss the ethical and cultural implications of excluding these factors, even if empirically weaker.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.