



# Comparison of Psychological Empowerment and Moral Distress in Male and Female Nurses

Sima. Alimohammadi Leilehkouhi<sup>1</sup>, Zahra. Foroughi Kaldareh<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.A. Student of Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: foroughi1399@gmail.com

### Editor

Seyed Hamid Atashpour<sup>id</sup>  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran  
hamidatashpour@gmail.com

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Shahrokh Makvand Hoseini<sup>id</sup>  
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Semnan University, Iran.  
Email: shmakvand@semnan.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Davood Taghvaei<sup>id</sup>  
Department of Psychology, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran.  
Email: d-taghvaeii@iau-arak.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction states that the study focuses on nurses in District 6 of Tehran, but no justification is provided for selecting this specific district. Is it representative of the general nursing population in Iran, or does it have unique characteristics?

The methods section states that participants were selected using "simple random sampling," but later it is mentioned that the sampling was "purposive." These two methods are not the same; please clarify which was used.

The study states that the Spreitzer Psychological Empowerment Questionnaire and the Moral Distress Questionnaire have been used but does not explain whether they have been validated in an Iranian nursing context. Has their validity been confirmed for this population?

The study employs an independent t-test and MANOVA for analysis, but no justification is provided for why these were the most appropriate methods. Given the small sample size, was the assumption of normality adequately checked?

The results report demographic characteristics, but there is no discussion of potential confounding variables. Were other demographic factors (e.g., years of experience, work setting) considered as potential covariates?

The introduction briefly mentions alexithymia, yet no substantial analysis is provided on this variable. Was it measured? If not, why was it mentioned in the introduction?

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph introducing psychological empowerment and moral distress lacks a clear operational definition of these concepts in the context of the study. Providing definitions aligned with established frameworks (e.g., Spreitzer, Hamric) would improve conceptual clarity.

The literature review refers to multiple studies but does not always provide a clear connection to the study's specific objectives. For example, the section mentioning "Molazem et al. (2022) found a strong relationship between moral distress intensity and diminished quality of work life among oncology nurses in Iran" does not directly tie into how this informs the gender comparison in the present study.

Table 1 lacks clear labeling of statistical values. For instance, it would be helpful to specify which values are means versus standard deviations, and whether Shapiro-Wilk test results indicate normality.

The discussion interprets findings but does not clearly tie them back to theoretical frameworks such as self-determination theory or job demands-resources model, which could provide a deeper explanation of gender differences in empowerment and distress.

The discussion assumes that the results are generalizable to all nurses, but given the study's limitation to District 6 of Tehran, this generalization may not be justified. A statement acknowledging this limitation would be appropriate.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.