

## Prediction of Attitudes Toward Marital Infidelity Based on Thinking Styles and Mindfulness with the Mediating Role of Emotional Attachment in Women

Sana. Dalali<sup>1</sup>, Hossein. Masoomi Jahandizi<sup>2\*</sup>, Mahtab. Moraveji<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

<sup>2</sup> PhD in Educational Psychology, Faculty Member at Zanjan University of Medical Science, School of Health, Department of Public Health, Zanjan, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of Nursing & Midwifery, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: hmjfh@zums.ac.ir

### Editor

Niloofer Mikaeili  
Professor of Psychology  
Department of Mohaghegh Ardabili  
University, Ardabil, Iran  
nmikaeili@uma.ac.ir

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Farideh Dokanehi Fard  
Associate Professor, Counseling Department, Roudehen Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudehen, Iran. Email: f.dokaneifard@riau.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Mohammad Masoud Dayarian  
Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Komeinishahr/Isfahan, Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph stating “Attitudes toward marital infidelity are particularly important because they influence individuals’ cognitive justifications...”, the authors define the construct but do not operationalize it in relation to the selected measurement tool. A stronger conceptual–measurement alignment is needed by explicitly connecting this definition to Whatley’s questionnaire dimensions.

In the paragraph beginning “Recent research has emphasized that attitudes toward marital infidelity are not formed in isolation...”, the literature review is comprehensive but lacks critical synthesis. The authors cite multiple studies sequentially without identifying inconsistencies, theoretical gaps, or methodological limitations in prior research, which weakens the argumentative depth.

In the section describing thinking styles (“Thinking styles, conceptualized within Sternberg’s theory...”), the authors provide a descriptive overview but do not clarify which dimensions of thinking styles are theoretically most relevant to

infidelity attitudes. The absence of a focused hypothesis regarding specific styles (e.g., legislative vs. conservative) reduces theoretical precision.

In the description of the Thinking Styles Questionnaire (“This questionnaire contains 65 items...”), the authors incorrectly interpret total score ranges (e.g., “scores between 1 and 65 indicate a low level”), which is mathematically inconsistent with the stated scoring range (65–325). This requires immediate correction.

In the Measures section describing the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory, the paragraph is excessively long and includes redundant psychometric details (e.g., multiple reliability indices) that could be condensed. The authors should streamline this section and focus on the most relevant validity evidence.

In Table 1 (“Descriptive Characteristics of All Components...”), the reported mean for “Thinking styles” (70.07) is inconsistent with its theoretical range (65–325), suggesting either a scoring error or mislabeling. This discrepancy raises concerns about data accuracy and must be clarified.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the mindfulness paragraph (“Mindfulness, defined as a nonjudgmental awareness...”), the authors rely heavily on general benefits of mindfulness without directly connecting these mechanisms to moral decision-making or relational boundaries. The argument would benefit from explicitly linking mindfulness to ethical cognition or impulse control in romantic contexts.

In the paragraph discussing attachment (“Another crucial factor in understanding attitudes toward marital infidelity is emotional attachment...”), the authors conflate “emotional attachment” with “interpersonal dependency” without adequately clarifying conceptual distinctions. Given that the measurement tool assesses dependency, the terminology should be aligned more rigorously.

In the paragraph beginning “The mediating role of emotional attachment is particularly relevant...”, the authors propose mediation conceptually but do not clearly articulate causal directionality or alternative models. Competing models (e.g., attachment as a moderator rather than mediator) should be acknowledged.

In the final paragraph of the introduction (“Despite the growing body of literature...”), the research gap is stated, but it remains somewhat generic. The authors should explicitly specify whether the novelty lies in population (women in Zanjan), model structure, or variable combination, to strengthen the study’s contribution.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.