





Contextual Factors of Men's Online Extramarital Relationships: A Qualitative Study

Zeinab. Hajizadeh¹, Farah. Lotfi Kashani^{2*}, Shahram. Vaziri², Qasem. Ahi³


¹ PhD student in clinical psychology, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran



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

* Corresponding author email address: lotfi.kashani@gmail.com

Editor

Ahmad Abedi¹
Associate Professor, Department of
Psychology and Education of People
with Special Needs, University of
Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
a.abedi@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Muhammad Rizwan¹
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad,
Pakistan. Email: muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk
Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia¹
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The sampling method described lacks detailed justification for the choice of purposive sampling, especially considering the sensitivity of the topic. Further clarification on how participants were assured anonymity and confidentiality during the recruitment and data collection phases could enhance the credibility of the methodological approach.

The study focuses solely on men from Mashhad. Including participants from diverse geographical and socio-economic backgrounds could enhance the generalizability of the findings. Consider discussing the limitations regarding participant diversity and how this might influence the findings.

The manuscript mentions that data saturation was achieved with twelve participants, but does not elaborate on how saturation was determined. A more detailed explanation could strengthen the methodological rigor. Were there no new themes emerging from the data, and how was this consistency verified?

While MAXQDA software was used for coding, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed description of the coding tree, including main and sub-categories with examples of how themes were derived from the data. This detail would aid in understanding the depth and thoroughness of the qualitative analysis.

Suggest avenues for future research that could address gaps left by the current study. For example, exploring the perspective of the partners affected by these online relationships, or a quantitative approach to validate the findings across a larger population, would provide complementary insights to the qualitative data presented here.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction briefly mentions various contributing factors to online extramarital relationships. It would be beneficial to include a more detailed review of previous studies that specifically address online extramarital behaviors compared to physical ones, providing a clearer theoretical framework and highlighting the novelty of your study within this context.

The description of reliability (test-retest reliability) is appreciated; however, enhancing the explanation about measures taken to ensure validity (beyond participant validation and expert reviews) could improve trust in the data analysis process. Consider discussing inter-coder reliability if more than one coder was involved.

The results are broadly categorized into four domains; however, the discussion could benefit from a deeper comparative analysis with existing literature, especially contrasting findings where the motivations for online and physical extramarital relationships diverge or converge.

The practical implications are well-noted but could be expanded. Specific, actionable recommendations for practitioners, policymakers, or individuals could be made clearer, particularly in terms of preventive strategies that could be employed based on the findings.

The limitations section would benefit from a more critical examination of the study's design. For instance, discussing the implications of researcher bias in qualitative research, especially in sensitive topics like extramarital relationships, and how it was mitigated in this study.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.