

Comparison of the Effectiveness of Transdiagnostic and Solution-Focused Therapies on Decision-Making Quality in Married Women

Zohreh. Ghodrati Isfahani¹, Seyed Hamid. Atashpour^{2*}, Zahra. Yousefi³


¹ Ph.D student in Counseling, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran



³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: hamidatashpour@gmail.com

Editor

Gholamreza Rajabi¹
Professor of Counseling
Department, Shahid Chamran
University, Ahvaz, Iran
rajabireza@scu.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Hadi Safi¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities & Social
Sciences, Ardakan University, Ardakan, Iran. Email: m.h.safi@ardakan.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Alireza Jafari¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Abhar Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Abhar, Iran. info@abhariau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript should more clearly define the control conditions and the interventions for each group. Specifically, it needs a detailed description of the content covered in the sessions for each therapy approach to enhance reproducibility.

Expand on the sampling process to include how participants were recruited, any potential biases this might introduce, and why the chosen demographic was targeted for this study, to strengthen the generalizability of the findings.

Given the reported violation of sphericity in the ANOVA tests, it would be beneficial to discuss why the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was chosen and provide a more in-depth explanation of the implications for the study's findings.

The follow-up period of 45 days may be too short to effectively gauge the long-term impacts of the treatments. Suggest extending this period and discussing the rationale for the chosen duration in the study design.

The manuscript should clarify why the Akhbari Decision Making Quality Questionnaire was chosen over other potential instruments, including a discussion on its validity and reliability in this particular research context.

There needs to be a more thorough discussion on how the findings compare with existing literature, particularly focusing on discrepancies or alignments with previous studies on transdiagnostic and solution-focused therapies.

Enhance the discussion on ethical considerations by detailing the measures taken to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants' responses, especially given the personal nature of the data collected.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Tighten the literature review to focus more directly on previous studies that directly compare the two therapies in question, to better position the study within the existing research landscape.

In the results section, consider using more visual aids such as graphs or charts to represent the changes in decision-making quality over time, making the data more accessible to readers.

Ensure that technical terms and therapy-specific jargon are clearly defined when first introduced to make the article more accessible to non-specialist readers.

The conclusions drawn from the study could be more tightly linked to the specific findings presented in the results section to strengthen the argument's coherence.

Several references appear outdated. Recommend updating the literature review with more recent studies to ensure the research context is grounded in the current understanding of the field.

Check the manuscript for formatting consistency, especially in the references and tables, to adhere to the journal's submission guidelines.

Minor grammatical and syntactical errors should be corrected throughout the document to enhance its professional quality and readability.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.