

Prediction of Infidelity Tendency Based on Love Styles and Personality Traits in Married Students

Malihe. Allahgoliyari¹, Bahareh. Ajdarbin^{1*}, Sakineh. Rahpeyma Aghmiami¹

¹ Department of Psychology, WT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: 0069077649@iau.ir

Editor

Azizuddin Khan 
Professor, Psychophysiology
Laboratory, Department of
Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology
Bombay, Maharashtra, India
khanaziz@iitb.ac.in

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Claudia Moreno Ruiz 
Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad de
Concepcion, Concepción, Chile.
Email: ruizmoreno@gmail.com
Reviewer 2: Gulcin Baktiroglu 
Department of Psychological Counselling, Faculty of Education, Yildiz Technical
University, Istanbul, 34349, Türkiye
Email: gulcin.baktiroglu@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “tendency toward infidelity is conceptualized as a cognitive–motivational readiness” would benefit from a short operational clarification connecting this definition to the specific measurement tool later employed in the study.

This paragraph emphasizes advanced analytical approaches in the literature; however, the present study relies on stepwise regression. Please justify this methodological choice and clarify why more complex models were not applied to the current dataset.

The paragraph beginning with “Attachment theory provides an additional explanatory layer” introduces a theoretical construct that is not empirically tested in the study. The authors should either delimit the scope of the study or explicitly state why attachment was not included in the model.

The description of ATIS validity relies on prior studies. Please clarify whether any validity checks (e.g., internal consistency or factor structure) were reassessed within the present sample.

The discussion focuses primarily on personality and love styles. Please acknowledge alternative explanations such as relationship duration, marital satisfaction, or cultural expectations that were not measured.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Several personality subscales display reliability coefficients near or below conventional thresholds. Please discuss how these values may influence interpretation of regression results.

The sample consists of 96% female participants. This extreme imbalance must be explicitly discussed in both the Results interpretation and Limitations section as it significantly constrains generalizability.

Although skewness and kurtosis values are reported, no threshold justification is provided. Please briefly explain why the observed values were considered acceptable for parametric analysis.

You report tolerance and VIF statistics but do not present their exact values. For transparency, these statistics should be included in a supplementary table or summarized numerically.

The use of stepwise regression requires justification due to its known statistical limitations. Please explain why this approach was preferred over theory-driven hierarchical regression.

The incremental variance contributions should be interpreted more explicitly in the text, particularly regarding their practical significance.

The sentence “agreeableness emerged as the strongest protective factor” uses causal phrasing that is not warranted in a correlational design. Please revise to reflect associational inference.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.