





# Comparison of the Effectiveness of Psychodrama Training and Psychological Empowerment on Anger Control and Distress Tolerance in Incarcerated Women

Ghazaleh. Esmaili Dehaghi<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad. Ghasemi Pirbalouti<sup>1\*</sup>, Reza. Ahmadi<sup>1</sup>, Fariba. Kiani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, ShK.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Bor.C., Islamic Azad University, Boroujen, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Mgh@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Silvia Helena Koller <sup>id</sup> Faculty member, Universidade Federal do Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil silvia.koller@pq.cnpq.br	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Ali Khodaei <sup>id</sup> Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mohsen Kachooei <sup>id</sup> Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The choice of 54 participants is not justified statistically. Please include a priori power analysis to demonstrate that this sample size was sufficient to detect meaningful effects.

The criterion “absence of acute psychiatric and physical disorders” is vague. Please specify how these conditions were assessed—was a standardized diagnostic tool used or only a brief clinical interview?

What activities or care did the control group receive? A no-intervention control may introduce ethical concerns and attention bias. Please elaborate.

The conclusion claims that both interventions “can significantly contribute to... preventing recidivism.” This claim is not directly supported by the data presented. Please revise to reflect the scope of outcomes measured.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Scores between 57 and 86 indicate low sense of coherence...” is inconsistent with the tool being about anger. Please revise or clarify the scoring interpretation and correct the construct referenced.

While groups are said to be randomly assigned, the method (e.g., random number generator, sealed envelopes) is not specified. Including this would enhance methodological transparency.

The control group showed decreases in anger control post-intervention, yet this is not discussed. Please address this finding in the interpretation, as it may reflect prison-related emotional decline or measurement artifact.

The sentence “the differences in mean scores between the posttest and the follow-up stages were not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ )” should also report the actual p-values to demonstrate that power was sufficient to detect change over time.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.