




A Phenomenological Analysis of Divorced Women's Experiences with Multiple Sexual Relationships After Divorce

Maliheh. Esfandiari¹, Nazanin. Honarparvaran^{2*}

¹ MSc, Family Consulting, Department of Counselings, Marv.C., Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran

² Assistant professor, Department of Counseling, Marv.C., Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: nazanin48@miau.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Donatella Di Corrado  Associate Professor, Department of psychology, Kore University of Enna, Enna, Italy donatella.dicorrado@unikore.it	Reviewer 1: Mohsen Kachooei  Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph provides a general overview but lacks a clear statement of the knowledge gap early on. I recommend moving the gap (“yet, despite extensive research...”) closer to the beginning to justify the study’s necessity.

“Approval for conducting the study was obtained from the relevant university ethics committee.” – Please provide the specific ethics approval code or reference number, as most journals require this.

“One of the primary findings centered on the theme of reconstruction of identity and selfhood.” – The presentation would be stronger if supported by at least one illustrative verbatim quotation from participants. Currently, results rely heavily on paraphrasing.

The table is clear, but the categories in the “Codes” column are sometimes too general (e.g., “fear of rejection”). Adding one or two verbatim participant phrases would enhance authenticity.

“By adopting a phenomenological approach, this study has illuminated...” – This is an appropriate wrap-up, but it could be strengthened by explicitly noting the applied value (e.g., for counselors, policymakers, or women’s advocacy organizations).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

“Historical analysis further demonstrates that divorce is not a purely modern phenomenon...” – While this historical background is valuable, it seems lengthy relative to the main aim. Consider shortening and focusing more directly on contemporary Middle Eastern or Iranian contexts.

“Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa suggests that multiple sexual relationships among women are associated with socioeconomic vulnerability...” – Please clarify how this body of literature relates to divorced women specifically. The connection between marital status and multiple partnerships should be made explicit.

“Taken together, the existing literature suggests that post-divorce sexual relationships...” – This is strong, but it blends the literature review with the study aim. I suggest explicitly stating: “The present study seeks to address this gap by...” before moving into the methodology.

Please clarify whether participants explicitly linked financial dependency to sexual decisions, or whether this was an analytic interpretation. Direct quotations would help distinguish participant voices from researcher interpretation.

“The findings of this study highlight the complex psychological, social, familial, economic, and identity-related dimensions...” – This restates the results without offering much new interpretation. Consider integrating the study’s unique contributions more clearly (e.g., what is novel compared to prior research).

“Another important result relates to the reconstruction of identity and gender roles after divorce.” – The section is strong but could benefit from highlighting cultural specificity. How do these identity processes differ in the Iranian context compared to Western or African studies cited?

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.