

A Comparative Study of the Impact of Virtual Space on the Lifestyle of User and Non-User Women in Garmsar City

Marziyeh. Galini¹, Mojtaba. Sedaghati Fard^{2*}, Shideh. Parnian²

¹ Ph.D. Student, Department of Sociology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: m.sedaghatifard@iau-garmsar.ac.ir

Editor

Niloufar Mikaeili

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

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia

Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami

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:

In the second paragraph of the introduction, you state that “Mindfulness-based interventions have been widely recognized for their effectiveness in various psychological domains.” While this claim is valid, citing at least two recent meta-analyses would provide stronger support for this assertion.

In the participants’ subsection, you mention, “The sample consisted of 60 women with sexual aversion disorder.” However, there is no explanation of why this sample size was chosen. Providing a power analysis or referencing previous studies with similar sample sizes would strengthen the justification.

The description of the mindfulness-based sex therapy intervention lacks sufficient detail. For instance, the statement “Participants engaged in weekly mindfulness exercises over eight weeks” does not specify session duration, content, or therapist qualifications. Providing a structured outline of each session will enhance reproducibility.

The description of the Sexual Self-Efficacy Scale states, “This scale has demonstrated good reliability in past studies.” However, specific psychometric properties (e.g., Cronbach’s alpha, test-retest reliability) from the current sample should be reported to confirm validity in this context.

There is no discussion of potential confounding variables such as relationship satisfaction, previous therapy experiences, or baseline psychological distress. A sentence explaining how these factors were controlled or acknowledged as limitations would improve methodological robustness.

The ethics section states, “Participants provided informed consent.” However, details about the ethical approval process (e.g., the institutional review board that approved the study, approval code) should be explicitly mentioned for transparency.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The final paragraph of the introduction suggests that the study fills a research gap by exploring sexual self-efficacy. However, this gap is not clearly articulated. Explicitly comparing previous research with the current study’s focus would clarify the novelty of the contribution.

The first paragraph of the methods section states, “This study employed a quasi-experimental design.” However, it does not specify whether it is a pre-test/post-test design or a non-equivalent control group design. Clearly defining the design is crucial for methodological transparency.

The results begin with inferential statistics without first presenting descriptive statistics (e.g., means and standard deviations of key variables). Adding a table summarizing baseline characteristics would enhance clarity and allow for better interpretation of changes over time.

In the results section, you report, “There was a significant improvement in sexual aversion symptoms ($p < 0.05$).” However, precise test statistics (e.g., t-value, F-value, confidence intervals) are missing. Following APA statistical reporting guidelines will improve clarity.

While significance levels are reported, effect sizes (e.g., Cohen’s d , η^2) are not included. Given that clinical significance is often as important as statistical significance, reporting effect sizes would provide a more meaningful interpretation of the findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. **Revised**

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.