




Designing a Process Model for Premarital Counseling

Reyhaneh. Bateni Noshabadi¹, Hamed. Mohammadi^{2*}, Abbas. Aynechi²

¹ PhD Candidate in Women's Studies, Faculty of Women and Family Studies, University of Religions & Denominations, Qom, Iran

² Assistant Professor of the Faculty of Women and Family Studies, University of Religions & Denominations, Qom, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: H.Mohammadi@urd.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic  Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Mehdi Rostami  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Consider clarifying the phrase “premarital counseling must be reimagined...” by specifying what current practices lack and how the envisioned transformation differs. Including an example of a “larger social and institutional system” would strengthen the argument.

While the rationale for homogeneous sampling is articulated, it would be helpful to justify why maximum variation was not considered, given the diversity of cultural norms across Iran, which could affect counseling relevance.

There is a discrepancy between the claim that participants had at least 5 years of experience and the presence of two individuals with only 5 years of experience. This should be clarified in relation to inclusion criteria.

The historical account of the Delphi method, while informative, could be condensed. Consider shifting some of the history to a footnote or appendix to improve focus on its current scientific application.

The dual mention of “formative” and “reactive” Delphi types is excellent, but the manuscript could be improved by explicitly stating how many Delphi rounds were conducted and whether consensus was statistically measured (e.g., IQR or Kendall’s W).

The theme is described comprehensively, but the subtheme titles (e.g., “Overlooked Institutional Capacities...”) are too long for internal headings. Consider shortening and refining them for clarity and readability.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Structured educational interventions... have demonstrated efficacy...” would benefit from a brief mention of the types of studies (e.g., RCTs, longitudinal) that support this efficacy claim, increasing empirical grounding.

The term “over-commercialization of premarital testing tools” is powerful. However, this claim would be more persuasive if supported by a concrete example or a citation from regulatory reports or critiques of private-sector practices.

The phrase “persistent gap in many countries, including Iran...” is quite general. It would be more precise to mention which national programs have failed or been absent, or to reference a specific institutional report.

The description of the research as “applied” and “theoretical” is clear, but it may help to justify why the chosen methodology (Delphi + thematic + SWOT) is best suited to reconcile these dual goals.

The idea of “intelligent evaluation and monitoring system” is compelling. It would be stronger if examples of technological tools or systems (even theoretical prototypes) were briefly described.

The sentence “If a counselor lacks the necessary insight...” could be supported by suggesting concrete training modules or existing cultural competence frameworks (e.g., Sue’s model).

The sentence “These insights align with studies underscoring the importance of evidence-based assessments...” would be clearer if the discussion elaborated on how the proposed model incorporates evidence-based decision-making explicitly.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.