




Comparing the Effectiveness of Emotion-Focused Therapy and Transactional Analysis Therapy on Interpersonal Problems in Conflicted Women Seeking Divorce


Atefeh. Amrollahi Biuki¹, Mahdi. Lashgari^{2*}, Hakime. Aghaei¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Sha.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrood, Iran



² Department of Psychology, Da.C., Islamic Azad University, Damghan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mlashgari@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Hussein OMAR Alkhozaher
Professor, Department of Sociology,
Al-Balqa' Applied University, Salt,
Jordan
huss1960@bau.edu.com

Reviewers

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: Nadereh Saadati
Department of Couple and Family therapy, Alliant International University,
California, United States of America. mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph (“Interpersonal problems in marital relationships are closely associated with deficits in emotional awareness...”), the authors list multiple contributing factors but do not integrate them into a coherent theoretical model. A stronger contribution would involve explicitly linking these factors to a unified framework (e.g., attachment theory, social exchange theory, or emotion regulation models), thereby enhancing theoretical depth and explanatory power.

The statement (“Women seeking divorce, in particular, are often exposed to heightened emotional distress...”) lacks sufficient theoretical or empirical justification for gender-specific focus. The manuscript should clarify whether gender differences are theoretically expected, empirically supported, or culturally contextualized, particularly given that interpersonal problems and marital conflict are dyadic phenomena.

The statement (“Effective therapeutic interventions can play a crucial role...”) is overly broad and lacks specificity. The authors should tie this claim directly to measurable outcomes or mechanisms relevant to their study rather than making general clinical assertions.

In Methods (“This study was applied in nature and employed a quasi-experimental design...”), there is a conceptual inconsistency: random assignment is mentioned, which typically characterizes experimental rather than quasi-experimental designs. The authors must clarify whether the design is truly randomized or quasi-experimental.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph introducing EFT (“One of the most prominent approaches...”), the discussion is largely descriptive and supportive. The manuscript lacks critical engagement with limitations or boundary conditions of EFT (e.g., cases where EFT is less effective), which is necessary for a balanced scholarly review.

The paragraph (“In parallel, transactional analysis (TA) therapy has emerged...”) presents TA in a largely simplified and linear manner. Given the complexity of TA (including script theory, injunctions, and drivers), the authors should elaborate on its deeper mechanisms to avoid reductionism and strengthen theoretical accuracy.

The subsequent paragraph (“Recent empirical studies have further supported the effectiveness of transactional analysis...”) repeats conceptual points from the previous paragraph rather than advancing new insights. This redundancy should be reduced, and the section should instead synthesize findings or highlight gaps in the literature.

The paragraph (“Despite the growing body of research supporting both EFT and TA...”) mentions the need for comparative studies but does not convincingly demonstrate a clear empirical gap. The authors should explicitly state what previous comparative studies have failed to address (e.g., population, methodology, or outcome variables).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.