




Comparison of the Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment–Based Couple Therapy and Integrative Couple Therapy on Dysfunctional Beliefs in Infertile Couples

Samaneh. Haji Abbasi¹, Majid. Saffarinia^{2*}, Ali Mohammad. Rezaie¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Arc.C., Islamic Azad University, Arsanjan, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m.saffarinia@pnu.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Seyed Hamid Atashpour  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran hamidatashpour@gmail.com	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.Komeinishar/Isfahan,Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The large paragraph discussing systemic family therapy (Bowen, 2003) feels conceptually dense. The authors should clearly distinguish which relational processes (e.g., fusion, emotional cutoff) are hypothesized to be most relevant for dysfunctional beliefs measured in this study. Currently, the theoretical bridge is indirect.

Inclusion criterion (e) states “no severe psychotic disorder, addiction, or chronic physical illness...based on self-report and preliminary interview.” This method may produce substantial misclassification. Consider clarifying whether structured clinical interviews (e.g., SCID) were considered or why they were not feasible.

Table 1 reports large decreases in dysfunctional beliefs, but effect sizes are not reported at the descriptive level. Providing Cohen’s d or partial η^2 for within-group change would help readers interpret the practical magnitude of improvements.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning with “Comparative studies between ACT and IBCT also demonstrate nuanced distinctions...” should more clearly identify why ACT-CT is expected to outperform IBCT specifically on dysfunctional beliefs (e.g., cognitive fusion vs. acceptance mechanisms). Strengthen the causal logic to align with your hypotheses.

The interaction effects reported (e.g., $F = 5.27$, $p = .001$) raise a concern: follow-up scores in some IBCT components increase relative to post-test (Table 1), yet interactions remain highly significant. Discuss whether sphericity corrections were applied and consider reporting Greenhouse-Geisser adjusted values.

The sentence “ACT-CT demonstrated superior outcomes for specific belief dimensions...” could be enhanced by referencing exact group-difference values (e.g., ACT–IBCT mean difference = -5.39 for total score) to strengthen the interpretation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.