



Comparing the effectiveness of cognitive-based play therapy and interactive play therapy on the cognitive appraisal of female students with special learning disabilities

Hoda. Shahzadeh Ahmadi¹, Ramezan. Hasanzadeh^{2*}, Mohammad Kazem. Fakhri³

¹ Ph.D. student of Educational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

² Professor, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: hasanzadehramzan@gmail.com

Editor

Ali Aghaziarati^{id}
Psychology and Education of
Children with Special Needs,
Faculty of Educational, University
of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran
alziarati@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Seyed Hadi Seyed Alitabar^{id}
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: hadialitabar@kmanresce.ca
Reviewer 2: Leila Panaghi^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Family Research Center, Shahid
Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: l_panaghi@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer: The study appears to be a valuable contribution to the field of educational psychology, especially in exploring therapeutic interventions for learning disabilities. Its focus on cognitive appraisal within the context of play therapy provides potentially new insights. However, the paper's strength lies in how well it articulates its findings and their implications within the broader field.

Reviewer: The introduction provides a solid foundation by discussing the impacts of specific learning disorders and their broader implications. A thorough literature review is present, but it should be checked for the inclusion of the most current research. The paper should explicitly state the research gap it aims to fill and outline specific objectives or hypotheses. This clarity helps in establishing the study's relevance and guiding the reader through its purpose and scope.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: In the methodology section, the selection criteria for participants should be clear, and all ethical considerations, particularly those involving consent, must be addressed. A detailed description of both cognitive-based play therapy and

interactive play therapy is necessary to understand their nature and ensure replicability of the study. Additionally, the procedures for implementing the therapies and the methods used for assessing outcomes, particularly cognitive appraisal, need to be thoroughly outlined.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The results should be presented in a clear and concise manner, potentially augmented with tables or figures for easier interpretation. It's important that the statistical methods used for data analysis are appropriate and justified. This section should objectively present the findings without interpretation, leaving the analysis for the discussion section.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The discussion should interpret the results in relation to the study's initial hypotheses and existing literature. It's crucial to highlight the practical implications of these findings, especially in therapeutic and educational contexts. Acknowledging the study's limitations and their potential impact on the findings is important for transparency. Suggestions for future research, based on the study's findings and limitations, should also be included.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: A concise summary of the key findings and their broader implications is needed in the conclusion. If applicable, recommendations based on the study's findings for practitioners or educators should be provided. This section should encapsulate the essence of the research and its contributions to the field.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The paper's overall structure, clarity, and presentation are critical for effective communication of the research. It should be well-written, logically organized, and adhere to APA style for citations and references. The quality of writing significantly affects the readability and professional appearance of the paper.

Response: Done.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer: The title clearly specifies the study's focus, but the abstract should be revised to succinctly encapsulate the research's purpose, methodology, results, and significant conclusions. It's essential for the abstract to communicate the study's significance and give a comprehensive overview in a brief format.

Reviewer: The introduction adequately sets the context for the study and highlights its relevance. However, it could benefit from a more explicit statement of how this research contributes uniquely to the existing body of knowledge. The problem statement is relevant but should be articulated more clearly, explaining why this comparison of therapies is particularly critical at this time.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The literature review seems comprehensive but could be enhanced by including more recent studies or meta-analyses for a broader perspective. A critical analysis of the existing literature is needed, identifying gaps or inconsistencies that this study addresses. This approach would strengthen the foundation of the research.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The research design is detailed, but a thorough justification for the chosen methods is needed, especially in relation to the study's objectives. Information on the sample selection process and its representativeness would add more credibility to the study.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: Results should be clearly and concisely reported, with visual aids like charts or graphs to aid understanding. The study should carefully distinguish between correlation and causation in interpreting these results, a common pitfall in research analysis.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The discussion should continuously link back to the research objectives and hypotheses. It's crucial to explore the broader implications of the findings, especially in terms of their influence on future research or practice. A comparative analysis with existing literature, noting any deviations or unexpected findings, would add depth to the discussion.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The conclusion should synthesize key findings, highlighting their significance and potential impact. It should offer forward-looking recommendations or considerations for future research, policy, or practice, encapsulating the essence of the research.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: The paper should maintain a consistent and clear narrative throughout, with particular attention to academic standards in formatting and referencing. Consistency and clarity in presentation are essential for effective communication of research findings.

Response: Done.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.