

Comparison of the Effectiveness of Cognitive–Behavioral Group Counseling and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Emotional Styles in Women on the Verge of Divorce

Fariba. Hamzeh¹, Azam. Fattahi Andabil^{2*}, Jamshid. Jarareh³

¹ PhD Student, Department of Counseling, Ki.C., Islamic Azad University, Kish, Iran

² Department of Counseling, Ro.C., Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran

³ Department of Educational Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Azam.fattahiandabil@iau.ir

Editor

Reviewers

Izet Pehlić

Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
izet.pehlic@unze.ba

Reviewer 1: Thseen Nazir

Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh

Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While the paragraph effectively establishes the significance of divorce as a psychosocial stressor, it would benefit from a clearer conceptual distinction between legal divorce, emotional divorce, and pre-divorce vulnerability. At present, these constructs are introduced sequentially but not analytically differentiated, which may obscure the specific phenomenon targeted by the study.

The manuscript does not report inclusion and exclusion criteria (e.g., psychiatric comorbidity, ongoing legal proceedings, concurrent therapy). These criteria are essential for evaluating internal validity and should be explicitly stated.

The reported Cronbach's alpha for the intimacy subscale ($\alpha = 0.59$) falls below commonly accepted thresholds. Please justify its adequacy or discuss potential implications for measurement reliability in the limitations section.

There appears to be an inconsistency between the stated item count (16 items) and the reported total score range (19–80). Please verify and correct this discrepancy to avoid confusion regarding scale scoring.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The manuscript defines emotional styles as “relatively stable,” yet later treats them as highly modifiable through short-term interventions. Please clarify this apparent conceptual tension by explaining whether emotional styles are considered trait-like but malleable or state-dependent, and cite theoretical sources that justify this position.

The citation of Gottman et al. (1997) is appropriate; however, the paragraph would be strengthened by explicitly mapping meta-emotion constructs onto the specific subscales of the Emotional Expressiveness Questionnaire used in this study, thereby improving construct alignment between theory and measurement.

This paragraph reviews prior CBT findings but does not sufficiently explain why CBT should differentially influence positive versus negative emotional expression. Consider adding a brief mechanistic explanation (e.g., cognitive reappraisal pathways) to strengthen the theoretical rationale.

The ACT framework is well described; however, the manuscript should more explicitly articulate why ACT might outperform CBT specifically in intimacy expression, as later claimed. This anticipatory hypothesis would strengthen the coherence between introduction and findings.

The research gap is clearly stated, but it would be beneficial to explicitly formulate comparative hypotheses (e.g., ACT > CBT on intimacy expression; both > control on total emotional styles) rather than leaving expectations implicit.

The use of voluntary sampling followed by random assignment requires clarification. Please specify whether allocation concealment was implemented and how randomization was operationalized (e.g., random number table, software-generated sequence).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.