




# Comparison of the Effectiveness of Group Schema Therapy and Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on Psychological Symptoms and Resilience in Individuals Seeking Divorce




Bahareh. Hasanpour Asil<sup>1</sup>, Mohammadreza. Zarbakhsh Bahri<sup>2\*</sup>, Tahereh. HamzehPoor Haghighi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD student in General Psychology, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Lahijan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mohsen Golparvar <sup>1</sup>  Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran mgolparvar@khuaisf.ac.ir	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Zahra Yousefi <sup>1</sup>  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuaisf.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mehdi Rostami <sup>1</sup>  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction discusses “psychological symptoms” but does not operationally define them until later. It would be clearer to define the construct earlier in the introduction.

The statement, “Despite prior studies on the psychological aspects of divorce, no research has comprehensively compared the effectiveness of group schema therapy and MBSR on psychological symptoms and resilience,” could be strengthened by citing studies that have examined related interventions and identifying their limitations.

The DASS-21 and CD-RISC were used, but internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) is only reported for one study (Najafi-Keliani et al., 2013). It would strengthen the methodology section to include a broader discussion of the instruments’ reliability across multiple studies.

The schema therapy intervention is well-described, but the therapist's level of training is not specified. Including information about the therapists' qualifications (e.g., licensed clinical psychologists, supervised trainees) would enhance the study's replicability.

The description of the MBSR intervention does not mention whether adherence checks were performed to ensure protocol fidelity. Was there a checklist for therapist adherence, or was the intervention manualized?

The findings mention that "the effects remained stable at the three-month follow-up," but no effect sizes are reported for these comparisons. Including Cohen's *d* or partial eta-squared would provide a clearer understanding of clinical significance.

Given that resilience and psychological symptoms are distinct but related constructs, it would be valuable to explore whether resilience mediates the relationship between intervention and psychological symptoms. If not conducted, acknowledge this as a limitation.

The Scheffé test showed significant differences, but the interpretation does not discuss whether these differences meet a clinically meaningful threshold. Adding discussion on practical significance would enhance the interpretation.

The discussion states, "These findings align with the study by Bagheri Sheikhan Gafsheh et al. (2021), which showed that schema therapy significantly reduces psychological disorders." It would be beneficial to clarify how the effect sizes and intervention duration compare between studies.

The study concludes that MBSR is more effective than schema therapy for reducing psychological symptoms. However, an alternative explanation (e.g., MBSR's focus on present-moment awareness and relaxation) is not explicitly discussed. This should be elaborated upon.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction claims that "students are increasingly engaging in virtual activities" but lacks specific statistics or studies to support this statement. Adding empirical evidence (e.g., percentage of students using virtual platforms) would strengthen this claim.

While the introduction references various studies (e.g., Rodríguez-Álvarez et al., 2021; Abdollahnejad, 2022), it does not explicitly discuss how they relate to the research question. Adding a comparison of findings from different studies could better contextualize the research.

The study relies on thematic analysis but does not mention a guiding theoretical model for curriculum design. Integrating a well-recognized educational theory (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy or Social Learning Theory) would provide a more structured foundation.

Since the study focuses on social and emotional competencies, incorporating psychological theories (such as Emotional Intelligence Theory or Self-Determination Theory) could provide additional depth.

The article discusses the importance of curriculum integration but does not reference established curriculum development models (e.g., Tyler's Model, Taba Model). Discussing how the proposed model aligns with or diverges from these could add credibility.

The study does not specify the demographic details of the participants (e.g., years of experience, academic background). Including such information would help assess the validity of expert opinions.

While the study mentions using semi-structured interviews, it does not provide details on the interview protocol (e.g., sample questions, duration). Including a brief description of key questions would improve transparency.

The discussion does not compare the study's findings with prior research in detail. Drawing more explicit comparisons would strengthen the argument for the study's contributions.

The study assumes that the proposed curriculum model is beneficial but does not address potential challenges (e.g., teacher resistance, technological barriers). Including a section on limitations would make the discussion more balanced.

The conclusion states that the curriculum model is effective but does not provide empirical validation (e.g., pilot testing or case studies). Suggesting future studies to test the model's efficacy would enhance its practical relevance.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## **2. Revised**

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.