

Explanation of the Model of Marital Commitment Based on Object Relations with the Mediating Role of Emotion Regulation

Mina. Rajabi¹, Majid. Zargham Hajebi^{2*}, Nader. Monirpour²

¹ PhD Student, Department of Psychology, Qom Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Qom Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: zarghamhajebi@qom-iau.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Arusyak Gevorgyan  Assistant Professor, Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovian, Yerevan, Armenia gevorgyanarusyak-6@aspu.am	Reviewer 1: Sirina Arakelyan  Lecturer At The Chair Of Developmental And Applied Psychology Of The Armenian State Pedagogical University After Kh, Abovyan, Armenia. Email: sirinaarakelyan@aspu.am Reviewer 2: Marieke Zwaanswijk  Dutch Knowledge Centre for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Utrecht, The Netherlands. Email: zorgenwelzijn@bsl.nl

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction lacks clarity on the specific societal factors contributing to the instability of marriages. It would be beneficial to expand on the various social dynamics at play and how they impact marital commitment, providing more recent citations.

The description of the Emotion Control Scale mentions that it includes subscales for "anger, depressed mood, anxiety, and positive emotion." However, the rationale for including these specific emotions in the context of marital commitment is not discussed. Consider elaborating on why these subscales are relevant to the study's objectives.

The description of the Object Relations Inventory could benefit from a more detailed explanation of how the subscales (e.g., alienation, insecure attachment) are operationalized in the context of marital commitment. It would also be helpful to provide a brief overview of the theoretical basis for using this scale in the study.

The correlation matrix indicates a significant relationship between object relations and marital commitment. However, the discussion of these correlations is brief. Consider expanding this section to explore the implications of these relationships in greater depth.

The model fit indices in Table 3 show acceptable values, but there is no discussion of what these indices mean in the context of the study. Providing a brief explanation of each index (e.g., GFI, RMSEA) and its significance would enhance the reader's understanding.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The distinction between "personal commitment," "moral commitment," and "obligatory commitment" could be more clearly articulated. Providing examples or case studies for each type would help readers better understand these concepts.

The study mentions purposive sampling and online platform notifications for participant selection. However, it does not explain why these particular platforms were chosen or how they might influence the sample's representativeness. Consider discussing the potential biases introduced by this sampling method.

The inclusion criteria include "Minimum education (literacy)," but it is not clear what level of literacy was required. This should be clarified to ensure the reproducibility of the study.

The use of Pearson correlation and path analysis is appropriate, but the rationale for choosing these methods is not provided. Consider explaining why these particular statistical methods were selected and how they align with the study's objectives.

The results in Table 1 present descriptive statistics, but the interpretation of these statistics is minimal. It would be beneficial to provide more detailed insights into what these statistics suggest about the relationships among the variables.

The Sobel test results confirm the mediating role of emotion regulation, but the discussion could be strengthened by providing more context about why this finding is significant. How does this mediation contribute to the existing literature on marital commitment?

The discussion of the findings is well-structured but could benefit from more explicit connections to the study's theoretical framework. How do the results align with or challenge the theories discussed in the introduction?

The discussion references several previous studies (e.g., Fardad et al., Hosu & Năstasă), but it does not critically engage with these studies. Consider discussing the similarities and differences between your findings and those of previous research in more detail.

The practical implications of the findings for couples therapy and marital counseling are not fully explored. It would be beneficial to discuss how the study's findings could be applied in clinical settings, providing specific examples.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.