

Comparing the Efficacy of Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, Brief Intervention, and Combined Intervention on Reducing Social Alienation in COVID-19 Recovery Patients in Andimeshk

Abbas. Rahmati¹, Reza. Ahmadi^{2*}, Shahram. Mashhadizadeh², Ahmad. Ghazanfari³

¹ Ph.D. student of General Psychology, Department of Psychology, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord,

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Rozgarden28@yahoo.com

Editor

Thseen Nazir
Professor of Psychology and
Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun
University, Istanbul, Turkey
thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammadreza ZARBAKHSH BAHRI
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakshsh@Toniau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University,
Tehran, Iran.
Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The descriptions of the cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), brief intervention, and combined intervention could be enhanced by providing more details on the content of each session. Specific examples of exercises or discussions could offer clearer insights into how these interventions differ and operate.

The section on statistical analysis using ANCOVA could benefit from more specific information about the assumptions checked prior to analysis, such as normality and homoscedasticity, to strengthen the validity of the statistical conclusions.

Expanding on how the findings compare with existing literature on the efficacy of CBT and brief interventions in similar populations would provide a more comprehensive background and justify the study's contributions more robustly.

Elaborate on the choice of the Melvin Seeman Social Alienation questionnaire, particularly how it compares with other potential instruments in measuring social alienation, to justify its selection more thoroughly.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

A more detailed description of the randomization process is needed to assure the reader of the allocation concealment and to minimize selection bias.

Providing a more comprehensive breakdown of demographic data (e.g., age distribution, gender, socio-economic status) would help in understanding if the interventions are equally effective across different subgroups.

Expand the discussion on ethical considerations, especially how participant confidentiality is maintained and the ethical handling of control group participants who receive no initial treatment.

Consider using more sophisticated analytical methods that could handle the complexities of longitudinal data, such as mixed models or growth curve analysis, to better account for individual variations over time.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.