


Article history: Received 09 February 2025 Revised 27 March 2025 Accepted 05 April 2025 Published online 10 April 2025

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Comparison of the Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy and Reality Therapy on Social Adaptation of Female High School Students with Symptoms of Nomophobia

Mansoureh Sadat. Ghoreishi 10, Reza. Khakpour 2*0, Simindokht. Rezakhani 20

¹ PhD Student, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran ² Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Reza.khakpour@iau.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Gholamreza Rajabi®	Reviewer 1: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri 👨
Professor of Counseling	Associate Professor Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad
Department, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran rajabireza@scu.ac.ir	University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia [©]
	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Consider enumerating or briefly categorizing these "numerous challenges" (e.g., operational inefficiency, budget constraints), which would provide a clearer foundation for the research justification.

The research questions are stated but not formally numbered or clearly separated. Consider reformatting them to enhance visibility and logical flow for the reader.

Please justify the use of the CCR model instead of BCC or SBM. Given the scale heterogeneity among logistics units, BCC might better capture variable returns to scale.

The linear programming formulation lacks explanation of each symbol (e.g., what is xij, yrj?). Please define every component to ensure mathematical transparency for a non-specialist reader.

This section would benefit from a justification for applying Markowitz in this context. Why is financial portfolio theory appropriate for evaluating logistics service units?

Please provide descriptive statistics (e.g., size, scope, geographic distribution) to justify their representativeness of the Ministry of Oil's logistics system.

The process for normalizing or weighting the inputs/outputs prior to DEA modeling should be described in more detail. Were weights imposed or derived?

The narrative does not explain why these companies were efficient. Please relate these findings to the specific characteristics or strategies of companies 3 and 6.

Please provide a specific hypothetical scenario or example to illustrate how policymakers could apply this model in real resource allocation decisions.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

You cite Li et al. but do not explain how their work is different from or related to your model. Please clarify how their DEA application informs or contrasts with your methodology.

This is a strong justification, but consider citing at least two more recent studies (2020–2024) that attempted similar integrations or addressed similar logistics evaluation problems.

Please clarify whether the study uses cross-sectional or longitudinal data, and specify the unit of analysis (e.g., branch, company, project).

How were these experts selected? Please describe the selection criteria, sample size, and justification for relying on expert opinion to define the initial indicators.

The transition into Table 1 needs elaboration. Include a summary of what each group of indicators represents and their theoretical basis in efficiency or risk assessment literature.

The optimization results are presented, but the objective function and constraints used in the Markowitz model are not stated. This should be explicitly described for reproducibility.

This assertion is valid but underdeveloped. Discuss how integration improved the explanatory power or decision-support capability compared to using DEA or Markowitz alone.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

