



From Challenge to Insight: The Effectiveness of a Cognitively Oriented Psychological Intervention on Reflective Functioning in Female Teachers of Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder

Mohsen. Karimiha¹, Hossein. Jenaabadi^{2*}, Allah Nazar. Alisofi³


¹ PhD Student, Department of Psychology, Zah.C., Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran

² Professor, Department of Education, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counselling, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran


* Corresponding author email address: hjenaabadi@ped.usb.ac.ir

Editor

Christian Wiesner
Professor at University College of
Teacher Education in Lower Austria
christian.wiesner@ph-noe.ac.at

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Stephen C. L. Lau
Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St, Louis, United States.
Email: lauc@wustl.edu

Reviewer 2: Mohsen Kachooei
Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities
Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the statement “Reflective functioning... has been increasingly recognized as a core component of effective teaching practice” would benefit from a more operational definition; specify whether reflective functioning is conceptualized strictly within mentalization theory or includes broader metacognitive constructs.

In the Introduction, the paragraph beginning “Mentalization theory provides a comprehensive framework” lacks a critical perspective; consider incorporating contrasting viewpoints or limitations of mentalization theory to strengthen theoretical rigor and avoid confirmatory bias.

In Methods, the statement “implementation... was conducted without the knowledge of the control group” is ambiguous; clarify whether this refers to single-blind conditions or simply lack of intervention exposure.

In Measures, the RFQ-8 reliability coefficients (e.g., $\alpha = 0.63, 0.67$) are relatively low; discuss the implications of marginal internal consistency for measurement validity in your sample.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the claim “teachers with higher levels of mentalization are better equipped to manage classroom dynamics” should be supported with more direct empirical evidence specifically from teacher populations rather than extrapolated from general psychological samples.

In the Introduction, the paragraph discussing autism (“The importance of reflective functioning becomes particularly salient...”) would benefit from clearer linkage between ASD characteristics and specific demands on teachers’ reflective functioning, rather than remaining at a general descriptive level.

In the Introduction, the section on interventions combines cognitive-behavioral and mindfulness approaches without clearly distinguishing their mechanisms; please delineate whether the intervention is integrative, sequential, or theoretically unified.

In the Introduction, the sentence “Emerging research has explored the role of technology-enhanced interventions” appears tangential; consider either expanding this into a coherent argument or removing it to maintain conceptual focus.

In Methods, the phrase “This study was applied in terms of purpose” is vague; replace with standard methodological terminology (e.g., “applied research design” or “intervention study”) to improve scientific precision.

In Methods (Participants section), the inclusion criteria state “at least three years of work experience” but do not justify this threshold; please provide a rationale or cite prior studies using similar criteria.

In Methods, the sampling process described as “teachers were identified and contacted” lacks transparency; specify how many were approached, how many declined, and whether any attrition occurred before randomization.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.