



Development of a Native Educational Package for Marital Life Enrichment Based on the Lived Experiences of Successful Couples

Soheila. Bagheri¹, Nazanin. Honarparvaran^{2*}, Yahya. Yarahmadi³


¹ Department of Counseling, Sa.C., Islamic Azad University, Sanadaj, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Counseling, Marv.C., Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran



³ Department of Psychology, Sa.C., Islamic Azad University, Sanadaj, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: nazanin48@miau.ir

Editor

Asoke Kumar Saha
Professor Department of
Psychology, Jagannath University,
Dhaka, Bangladesh
drasoke@psychology.jnu.ac.bd

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Ali Khodaei
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam
Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada.
Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening paragraph of the Introduction (“Marital relationships constitute one of the most fundamental social institutions...”) is conceptually strong but overly general; it would benefit from a sharper problematization by explicitly identifying a measurable gap (e.g., lack of culturally grounded intervention protocols) earlier in the paragraph rather than relying on broad sociological framing.

In the second paragraph (“The concept of marital enrichment refers to structured interventions...”), the authors cite effectiveness evidence but do not differentiate between prevention-oriented versus therapy-oriented programs; clarifying this distinction would strengthen conceptual precision and situate the current study more clearly within prevention science.

The third paragraph (“Despite the demonstrated effectiveness...”) raises the issue of cultural limitations; however, the argument remains somewhat descriptive. The authors should operationalize “cultural sensitivity” by specifying which cultural constructs (e.g., collectivism, religiosity, gender role norms) are underrepresented in existing Western models.

In the fourth paragraph (“In recent years, qualitative studies have increasingly focused...”), the authors reference grounded theory studies but do not critically evaluate methodological differences among them; a brief methodological comparison would help justify the current hybrid phenomenological-grounded theory design.

The paragraph beginning “Moreover, the importance of communication patterns...” would benefit from integrating effect sizes or at least comparative findings across studies, rather than listing constructs (communication, emotional regulation) in a largely narrative form.

In the “Data Analysis” section, the explanation of coding procedures is methodologically sound but somewhat textbook-like; the authors should provide at least one concrete example of how a raw statement was transformed into a code and then into a category.

The statement “inter-coder reliability was assessed” lacks quantitative detail; the actual agreement coefficient (e.g., Cohen’s kappa) should be reported to substantiate reliability claims.

In Table 1, some axial categories (e.g., “Healthy interpersonal ethics” vs. “Preservation of relational dignity and respect”) appear conceptually overlapping; clearer differentiation or hierarchical structuring would improve analytical clarity.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph “Another important dimension in marital life enrichment...,” the discussion of support systems is theoretically relevant but lacks integration with established frameworks such as attachment theory; explicitly linking “emotional security” to attachment constructs would improve theoretical depth.

The paragraph on spirituality (“Spirituality and shared value systems...”) is conceptually rich but lacks critical nuance; the authors should acknowledge potential variability (e.g., differential effects of religiosity across genders or socioeconomic groups) to avoid overgeneralization.

The final paragraph of the Introduction (“Despite the growing body of research...”) effectively identifies a gap, but it redundantly reiterates earlier claims; condensation and a more direct transition to the research aim would improve coherence.

In the “Study Design and Participants” section, the statement “a phenomenological approach integrated with grounded theory methodology” requires stronger methodological justification, as these approaches are epistemologically distinct; the authors should clarify how they reconciled phenomenological description with theory generation.

The sampling description (“fifteen successful couples... based on theoretical saturation”) lacks transparency regarding saturation criteria; the authors should specify how saturation was operationalized (e.g., no new codes in last three interviews) to enhance methodological rigor.

The definition of “successful couples” is mentioned (“based on predefined criteria, including high marital satisfaction scores”) but not fully operationalized; the specific measurement instrument and cutoff thresholds should be explicitly stated.

In the “Measures” section, the phrase “researcher-developed semi-structured interviews” raises concerns about instrument validity; although expert review is mentioned, more detail on pilot testing or iterative refinement is needed.

The description “each interview lasted between 40 and 120 minutes” indicates variability; the authors should explain whether interview length influenced data depth or coding density, as this has implications for analytic consistency.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.