

Article history: Received 24 January 2024 Revised 20 February 2024 Accepted 29 February 2024 Published online 10 March 2024

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Comparing the Effectiveness of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and Acceptance and Commitment Training on Cognitive Flexibility in Adolescent Girls

Shamim. Khalili¹, Mostafa. Hamideh^{2*}

¹ M.A student in clinical psychology, West Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
² Professor of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Mostafahamdieh@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Seyed Ali Darbani	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Assistant Professor, Department of	Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences
Psychology and Counseling, South	and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir
Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad	Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami
University, Tehran, Iran	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While the methodology is generally well-described, further details on the randomization process could enhance transparency. Specifically, elaborating on how the randomization was conducted to ensure equal distribution of participants' characteristics across groups would strengthen the study's validity.

The statistical analysis section is well-conducted; however, including effect sizes for the main findings would provide additional insights into the practical significance of the interventions.

The limitations section is adequately addressed, but further discussion on the implications of these limitations for future research, particularly in exploring different therapeutic modalities or populations, would be beneficial.

Some references seem to be from earlier years. An update or addition of recent studies, particularly from 2022 or 2023, would enrich the context and demonstrate the manuscript's relevance to current research trends.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.



1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The theoretical grounding of the study could be strengthened. A more detailed explanation of the mechanisms through which CBT and ACT are hypothesized to affect cognitive flexibility would provide a stronger foundation for the study.

More detailed demographic information and baseline characteristics of the participants could be included to assess the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, exploring the impact of potential confounding variables, such as prior therapy experiences or severity of cognitive inflexibility at baseline, would enhance the study's depth.

The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed description of how intervention fidelity was assessed and maintained throughout the study. This includes the training and supervision of therapists delivering the interventions.

The use of a no-intervention control group raises questions about potential placebo effects. Future iterations of this research might include an active control group to more accurately isolate the effects of CBT and ACT.

The study's design could be significantly enhanced by including follow-up assessments to determine the long-term effects of CBT and ACT on cognitive flexibility. This would provide valuable insights into the sustainability of treatment gains.

The manuscript would benefit from a broader discussion of findings in the context of existing literature, particularly where results diverge from previous studies. This could include hypotheses about why these differences might exist based on the study's methodology or participant characteristics.

Expanding the literature review to include a wider range of studies on CBT and ACT applications beyond cognitive flexibility could offer readers a more comprehensive understanding of the field.

Consideration should be given to addressing potential biases and improving the study's internal validity. This could involve blind assessments or more rigorous controls for experimenter bias.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

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

