


The Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment-Based Training on Sense of Coherence and Regret of Spouse Selection in Women

Shakiba. Khabazand^{1*} 


¹ Department of Clinical Psychology, Sar.C., Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Shakiba.khbznd@gmail.com

Editor

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

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Roodabeh Hooshmandi
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: roodhooshmandi@kmanresce.ca
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 paragraph of the introduction (“The institution of marriage constitutes one of the most fundamental social and psychological structures...”) is conceptually strong but lacks a clear operational definition of “spouse selection.” It is recommended to explicitly define this construct early in the paragraph and clarify whether it is treated as a cognitive decision-making process, a socio-cultural phenomenon, or a psychological construct to improve conceptual precision.

In the second paragraph (“Recent sociological and psychological investigations highlight that shifts in modern societies...”), the argument regarding modernization and individualism is compelling; however, the paragraph would benefit from integrating a theoretical framework (e.g., modernization theory or individualization theory) to anchor the discussion and avoid a purely descriptive tone.

The third paragraph (“Empirical evidence suggests that regret associated with spouse selection...”) introduces important outcomes such as marital burnout and emotional disengagement, but it lacks a clear explanation of causal directionality. It is suggested to clarify whether regret is conceptualized as a predictor, mediator, or outcome variable within the broader relational model.

In the ninth paragraph (“Despite the growing evidence supporting the effectiveness of ACT...”) the research gap is identified, but it is somewhat broad. It would be beneficial to specify more precisely what is unknown (e.g., lack of experimental designs, absence of cultural validation, or lack of dual-outcome studies).

The final paragraph of the introduction (“In light of the aforementioned considerations...”) clearly states the aim; however, it could be strengthened by explicitly formulating hypotheses (e.g., ACT will increase sense of coherence and decrease regret), which are currently implied but not formally stated.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the fourth paragraph (“In parallel, the concept of sense of coherence...”) the construct of sense of coherence is introduced adequately, yet the paragraph would benefit from explicitly referencing Antonovsky’s salutogenic model as the theoretical foundation to strengthen theoretical grounding.

The fifth paragraph (“Research indicates that sense of coherence is not a fixed trait...”) discusses intervention effects but does not clearly link these mechanisms to ACT specifically. It is recommended to explicitly bridge the general intervention literature with ACT processes to maintain conceptual coherence across the introduction.

The sixth paragraph (“Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), as a third-wave behavioral intervention...”) provides a good overview of ACT processes; however, the explanation is somewhat descriptive. It would benefit from a more analytical discussion of how each ACT process (e.g., cognitive defusion, acceptance) specifically relates to regret and sense of coherence.

In the seventh paragraph (“A growing body of empirical research supports the effectiveness of ACT-based interventions...”), the cited studies are relevant, but the paragraph lacks critical evaluation. Including limitations of prior studies or inconsistencies in findings would enhance scientific rigor.

The eighth paragraph (“Furthermore, the integration of ACT principles...”) repeats some concepts from the previous paragraph, particularly regarding ACT effectiveness. It is recommended to reduce redundancy and focus instead on unique contributions such as comparative effectiveness or mechanism-based explanations.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.