




The Relationship Between Passion for Life and Passion and Indifference Toward Sexual Relations in Married Students

Fatemeh Hana. Mohammadi^{1*}, Bahram. Mirzaian²

¹ Master of general psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: F.mohammadi4178@iau.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić  Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Mohsen Golparvar  Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. mgolparvar@khuif.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening focus on suicidal ideation seems misaligned with the stated research objective on passion for life and sexual relations. Consider revising the first two paragraphs to better lead into the study's central constructs and reduce thematic drift.

This section is well-researched but creates conceptual overload. Tighten the link between fear of negative evaluation and the study's key variables (passion for life and sexual orientation) or move some content to a related work subsection.

The breakdown of items is clear but long. Consider adding a brief rationale for using this instrument and whether its factor structure was confirmed in your sample.

The statement about ordinal data and Likert scaling is correct but vague. Specify the scale range (e.g., 1–5 or 1–7) and justify the use of Spearman correlation given the data properties.

The table is informative but needs clarity: the “Emotional Orientation” composite is unexplained. Define how it was calculated and its theoretical justification to avoid confusion for readers.

The table shows extremely high correlations among some subscales (e.g., .79 and .87). Discuss potential multicollinearity or overlapping constructs in the Discussion, as these large intercorrelations might question discriminant validity.

The discussion should critically reflect on the surprising positive link between passion for life and sexual indifference before aligning it with theory. Currently, it is mentioned but not problematized enough.

Strengthen the theoretical grounding by explaining why the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand) can justify both the passion and indifference findings rather than only passion.

Excellent insight about cultural influences, but it would benefit from direct empirical citations on sexual communication taboos in Iranian or Middle Eastern contexts to anchor the argument.

Expand on how interventions could differentiate between “adaptive reprioritization” and “pathological disengagement” in sexual relationships, as this is a key applied contribution.

The recommendations for practice are helpful but could benefit from more concrete program suggestions or references to existing marital enrichment frameworks that integrate vitality and sexual well-being.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the literature review is thorough, there is an imbalance: the review devotes extensive space to suicide and minority stress but very little to passion constructs. Consider adding more foundational literature about “passion for life” and sexual relational dynamics to balance theoretical framing.

The use of convenience sampling should be acknowledged as a major limitation. Please expand on the implications for external validity and potential selection bias in the Methods or Limitations section.

While alpha coefficients are reported, other psychometric properties such as construct validity, factor structure, or measurement invariance across gender are not addressed. Consider briefly reporting these if available or acknowledging their absence.

This section is adequate but could acknowledge the potential for self-report bias due to the sensitivity of sexual topics and the cultural context, beyond the general note on social desirability.

It would strengthen this section to explain how the academic and age-related characteristics of this sample (likely younger, educated) could affect generalizability to broader married populations.

This paragraph is thoughtful but could also propose testing moderating effects (e.g., personality traits, cultural values, gender role attitudes) that might clarify the passion–indifference paradox.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.