

Stress, Resilience, and the Immune System: A Health Psychology Analysis


Seyed Milad. Saadati ^{*1}, Fatemeh. Reza zadeh ²

¹ Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology (LMP), University of Toronto, Canada



² Master's student, Family Counseling Department, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m.saadati@mail.utoronto.ca

Editor

Parvaneh Mohammadkhani 
Professor, Department of Clinical
Psychology, University of
Rehabilitation Sciences and Social
Health, Tehran, Iran.
Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Asghar Jafari 
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran.
Email: as_jafari@sbu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Monika Szczygiel 
Department of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland.
Email: monika.szczygiel@uj.edu.pl

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Deepen the critique of included studies, focusing on methodological strengths and weaknesses.

Update the literature review to include the most recent studies.

Broaden the theoretical discussion to incorporate diverse perspectives.

Provide more detailed analysis of practical implications, including real-world implementation challenges and solutions.

Clearly outline specific research gaps and suggest methodological approaches for future studies.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The review is well-organized, with clear sections and a logical flow. Minor clarifications in certain sections could further enhance readability and understanding.

Ensuring consistency in the use of key terms related to stress resilience and immune function throughout the article would aid reader comprehension.

While the article cites a broad range of sources, ensuring that all references are up-to-date and relevant to the article's scope would strengthen its foundation.

The article could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the inherent limitations of the reviewed studies and the narrative review method itself, including potential biases in study selection and interpretation.

While the article suggests several interventions, providing clearer, more detailed recommendations for their application in practice would be valuable for practitioners and policymakers.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.