Ranking Pathways to Forgiveness in Families After Abuse Disclosure

Lilit. Martirosyan[1] , Asma. Trabelsi[2]*

[1] Department of Social Psychology, Armenian State Pedagogical University, Yerevan, Armenia
[2] Department of Psychology and Consulting, University of Sfax, Sfax, Tunisia

* Corresponding author email address: Asma.trabelsi@usf.tn

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Shahram Vahedi	**Reviewer 1:** Ali Akbar Soleymanian
Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran vahedi117@yahoo.com	Associate Professor of Counseling Department, Bojnord University, Iran. Email: Soleymanian@ub.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Hajar Torkan
	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Isfahan, Iran. h.torkan@khuisf.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The definition should explicitly distinguish between interpersonal forgiveness, self-forgiveness, and systemic forgiveness, as these terms recur in later sections. A conceptual clarification early on would reduce interpretative ambiguity.

The transition to the study aim feels abrupt. Consider a bridging sentence summarizing the research gap (e.g., "Despite extensive research, no empirical model has prioritized the relative importance of these forgiveness dimensions…").

Clarify how the integration between phases was operationalized (e.g., were the qualitative findings quantitatively validated, or did they merely inform survey construction?). This is essential for establishing methodological rigor.

Provide inclusion and exclusion criteria (e.g., professional experience level, family trauma exposure) to enhance transparency and potential reproducibility.

Specify the reliability coefficient type (e.g., Cohen's kappa, Krippendorff's alpha) and how many coders were involved. This would improve methodological precision.

Include sample items or an appendix reference to demonstrate content validity. Clarify whether pilot testing was conducted and how construct validity was ensured.

While this paragraph offers excellent thematic explanation, incorporating brief participant quotations or exemplars (even from literature sources) could enhance ecological validity and illustrate conceptual nuance.

Expand on how cognitive reframing mediates forgiveness outcomes—perhaps linking to cognitive-behavioral or meaning-making theories—to move from descriptive to explanatory insight.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This section could be enriched by linking forgiveness therapy to broader trauma recovery theories (e.g., Herman's trauma stages or Enright's forgiveness model), thereby situating the study within an established theoretical lineage.

The paragraph summarizes findings well but lacks critical analysis. Consider evaluating contradictions among cited studies—such as differing outcomes between collectivist and individualist family systems—to provide a more nuanced literature synthesis.

While Tunisia is mentioned, the rationale for choosing this context needs elaboration. Explain whether Tunisia represents a typical collectivist context or if it was chosen due to unique cultural or postcolonial dynamics affecting forgiveness discourse.

Include chi-square degrees of freedom and exact Kendall's W interpretation (e.g., "indicating moderate-to-strong agreement among raters") to strengthen statistical transparency.

The discussion could explicitly align these findings with theoretical frameworks (e.g., Enright's forgiveness phases or Worthington's REACH model) to deepen conceptual implications.

Avoid overgeneralizing to all family systems; specify that findings are grounded in the Tunisian cultural sample. Consider adding a cautionary statement about potential cross-cultural limitations.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.