

Comparing the Effectiveness of Art Therapy and Cognitive Behavioral Play Therapy on Anxiety and Assertiveness in Preschool Children


Sudabeh. Emami Mehr¹, Mojtaba. Amiri Majd^{1*}, Mohammad. Ghamari¹, Saeideh. Bazzazian²

¹ Department of Psychology, Ab.C., Islamic Azad University, Abhar, Iran



² Department of Psychology, WT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mo.amiri@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Anela Hasanagic
Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.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:

In the second paragraph of the introduction, the claim “These early difficulties highlight the critical need for timely preventive and therapeutic interventions” is conceptually valid but underdeveloped; it would benefit from explicit linkage to developmental psychopathology frameworks such as transactional models or risk–resilience paradigms.

In the paragraph beginning “Low assertiveness is one of the behavioral manifestations...,” the conceptual relationship between anxiety and assertiveness is presented linearly, but the literature suggests bidirectional and potentially moderating effects; you should refine the theoretical model accordingly.

In the assumption testing section, the sentence “Box's M test... (F = 1.011, P < 0.05)” is incorrectly interpreted; a significant Box's M typically indicates violation of homogeneity of covariance matrices, not confirmation, which suggests a methodological error.

In Table 4 results, the reported value “F = 843.13” for art therapy appears implausibly large and inconsistent with other reported statistics; this likely indicates a reporting or calculation error that must be corrected.

In the paragraph “These finding suggests that both art therapy and CBPT were effective...,” there is a grammatical error (“finding” → “findings”) and conceptual inconsistency, as earlier results suggested no difference, yet here CBPT is implied as more pronounced.

In the discussion, the sentence “This is inconsistent with studies in literature” is too general; specify which studies and clarify whether inconsistency relates to effect size, direction, or statistical significance

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the intervention description paragraph, the sentence “Art therapy is effective in both mental health... and physical health in children” is overly broad and lacks mechanistic explanation; specify the pathways (e.g., emotional regulation, sensory integration) through which these outcomes are achieved.

In the same section, the contrast “In contrast, CBPT integrates cognitive-behavioral principles...” is well structured, but the theoretical grounding would be strengthened by explicitly referencing core CBT constructs such as cognitive distortions, exposure hierarchies, and reinforcement contingencies.

In the final paragraph of the introduction, the statement “there is a notable lack of direct, head-to-head comparisons” should be substantiated with a brief systematic search justification or citation of review papers to support the claimed research gap.

In the methods section, the phrase “between mid-October and mid-February 2012” raises concerns about temporal relevance; given the publication context, you should justify the use of older data or clarify whether this is a typographical error.

In the sampling description, the sentence “Using Cochran’s formula... $q = p = 0.05$ ” appears mathematically inconsistent, as typically $p = 0.5$ is used for maximum variability; this requires correction or justification.

In the inclusion criteria paragraph, the statement “children did not present with concurrent clinical disorders” is vague; specify how this was assessed (e.g., structured diagnostic interview, clinical screening checklist).

In the intervention procedure section, the unequal number of sessions (“10 sessions” vs. “12 sessions”) introduces a potential confounding variable related to treatment dosage; this should be justified or statistically controlled.

In the measurement section, the sentence “Cronbach’s alpha for the assertiveness scale was determined to be 0.72” suggests acceptable but not strong reliability; you should discuss its implications for measurement precision.

In the results section, the demographic description “Experimental group 1 included 40% girls and 60% boys...” would benefit from a statistical test (e.g., chi-square) to confirm group equivalence at baseline.

In Table 3 interpretation, the statement “assertiveness increased to 41.46... and 44.06...” is descriptive but lacks inferential support; you should explicitly reference statistical tests (e.g., adjusted means from ANCOVA).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.