




The Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Rejection Sensitivity and Self-Acceptance in Individuals with Visual Impairment

Soleyman. Oveysi¹, Qumarth. Karimi^{2*}, Omid. Moradi³


¹ Department of Counseling, Sa.C., Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Mah.C., Islamic Azad University, Mahabad, Iran


³ Department of Family Counseling, Sa.C., Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: qumarth@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Seyyed Mohsen Asgharinekah
Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
asghari-n@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Masoud Asadi

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran.

Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Mojtaba Tamadoni

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. m_tamadoni@azad.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning “Visual impairment and blindness represent significant global public health concerns...”, the authors provide an appropriate contextual background; however, the paragraph remains largely descriptive. The manuscript would benefit from inclusion of recent prevalence statistics (e.g., WHO global estimates) and clearer linkage between epidemiological burden and psychological intervention necessity. Please explicitly justify why psychological constructs—rather than functional rehabilitation—constitute the focus of this study.

In the paragraph starting “Psychological adaptation to vision loss is often characterized by a demanding process...”, the manuscript discusses adjustment processes but does not differentiate between congenital vs. acquired visual impairment. Since psychological adaptation pathways differ substantially, the authors should clarify which population predominates in the sample and theoretically anchor the discussion accordingly.

The paragraph defining rejection sensitivity states that it is “a cognitive–affective processing tendency characterized by heightened expectations of rejection...”. The construct is introduced clearly; however, no explicit theoretical model (e.g.,

attachment-based rejection sensitivity model) is referenced. Please strengthen theoretical grounding by identifying the dominant framework guiding construct selection.

The sentence “Despite growing empirical support, research specifically examining the simultaneous effects...” correctly identifies a gap; however, the novelty claim would be stronger if supported by a systematic comparison table or explicit statement of previous outcome variables studied in ACT–visual impairment research.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Following the sentence “Persistent exposure to perceived rejection may therefore contribute to maladaptive coping patterns...”, the argument moves directly to self-acceptance without explicitly explaining the theoretical relationship between rejection sensitivity and self-acceptance. A conceptual bridge paragraph is recommended to explain whether self-acceptance functions as mediator, outcome, or parallel construct.

In the paragraph beginning “The emergence of third-wave behavioral therapies has provided new frameworks...”, ACT is introduced broadly. The authors should more clearly articulate why ACT is theoretically superior or uniquely appropriate for visually impaired populations compared with CBT, mindfulness-based therapy, or supportive counseling.

The paragraph discussing psychological flexibility claims it is “the primary mechanism of therapeutic change.” This statement requires stronger empirical justification. Please cite meta-analytic evidence demonstrating mediation effects of psychological flexibility where available.

The paragraph beginning “Evidence increasingly supports the effectiveness of ACT for individuals with visual impairment.” summarizes prior findings but lacks critical evaluation. The authors should discuss methodological limitations of previous studies, thereby clarifying how the present study advances the literature rather than merely replicating it.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.