







Study of the Phenomenon of Interfaith Marriage Based on the Lived Experiences of a Group of Non-Co-Religious Men in Iran

Elham. Habibi¹, Farah Torkaman^{2*}, Zahra Hazrati Someeh²

¹ Department of Social Sciences, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of Sociology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Fa.torkaman@iauctb.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Azizuddin Khan  Professor, Psychophysiology Laboratory, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Maharashtra, India aziz@hss.iitb.ac.in	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani  Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh  Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction provides a broad context for the study, but the paragraph transitions could be more seamless. For instance, the shift from discussing Iranian marriage culture to intergroup marriage generally could benefit from clearer linking sentences.

The introduction introduces multiple theories (e.g., Giddens' theory, boundary theory, religious power relations). However, the relationship between these theories and the study's objectives needs to be more explicitly connected. Consider revising to clarify how each theory informs the research question.

The quote, "In Iran, intergroup marriages between different social groups have also expanded..." could be expanded with The description of theoretical saturation is well-written, but it would benefit from clarification regarding how saturation was determined. For example, were specific criteria used to decide that no new themes were emerging?

The validity measures described (e.g., participant agreement on coding) are sound. However, the methods could be expanded with details about triangulation or peer review of codes to ensure robustness.

There is some confusion regarding the number of codes (e.g., 1,027 versus 1,746). Clarify whether these include duplicates or reflect distinct concepts.

The theoretical model is described but not visualized. Including a diagram or table summarizing the axial and selective coding categories would enhance understanding.

The discussion would benefit from a more detailed exploration of the practical implications of the findings for policy or interfaith dialogue in Iran.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research gap is implied but not explicitly stated. Consider adding a specific statement highlighting how this study addresses a gap in existing literature on interfaith marriages in Iran.

The research question is stated at the end but could be framed earlier to provide a clear direction for the introduction. This might help guide the reader through the theoretical discussions.

While the study focuses on men, there is no justification provided for this limitation. Consider explaining why only men were included and whether this might affect the generalizability of the findings.

The coding process is briefly explained, but more detail is needed about how categories were derived during axial coding. What criteria were used to determine the 45 subcategories?

Since the study focuses solely on men, the findings could reflect gendered biases. Discussing how women's perspectives might differ or complement these findings could enhance the discussion.

The findings section does not explicitly tie the results back to the theoretical frameworks mentioned in the introduction. Consider revising to make these connections clearer.

The study is highly context-specific. To increase its academic relevance, discuss how these findings might apply to interfaith marriage dynamics in other religious or cultural contexts.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.