

The Effectiveness of Emotion-Focused Therapy on Job Stress and Emotion Regulation in Employed Women in Tonekabon




Nadia. Arjmandi¹, Elaheh. Sadeghi^{2*}, Morteza. Tarkhan³

¹ Master's student, General Psychology, Ayandegan Institute of Higher Education, Tonekabon, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Ayandegan Institute of Higher Education, Tonekabon, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Nadiarjmandi1991@gmail.com

| E d i t o r | R e v i e w e r s |
|---|--|
| Silvia Helena Koller  Faculty member, Universidade Federal do Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil silvia.koller@pq.cnpq.br | Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir |

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The claim “employed women... are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of job-related stress” needs to be nuanced with population-based evidence. Consider citing prevalence statistics or meta-analytic data to support this claim.

The claim that participants had “absence of psychological disorders” lacks support. Please specify the screening tool or procedure used to determine mental health status.

While psychometric properties for the ERQ in Iranian populations are cited, there’s no reference to validity indices (e.g., CFA) supporting construct validity in this cultural context. Please add if available.

Session two reportedly uses “Freud and Ekman” for emotional theory. These two theorists come from vastly different schools (psychodynamic vs. facial-affect theory). Consider justifying this eclecticism or replacing one with a more congruent framework (e.g., Greenberg’s emotion theory).

There is no mention of treatment fidelity, therapist training, or supervision. Please report whether a standardized manual was followed and how therapist adherence was monitored.

For example, “coping strategies for high job demands” in session seven should include specific techniques (e.g., problem-focused coping, boundary setting) to strengthen methodological transparency.

You mention that the “experimental group showed an increase in cognitive reappraisal strategies,” but the study only used the ERQ total score in analysis. If subscale analyses were performed, they should be reported in the Results section; otherwise, remove this claim.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Phrases such as “emotional dissonance” and “unresolved psychological conflicts” appear without precise operational definitions. Briefly define or contextualize them within occupational stress literature to avoid conceptual vagueness.

The manuscript asserts that EFT “promotes adaptive emotion regulation strategies” but does not elaborate on how this occurs neurocognitively or experientially. A brief mechanism (e.g., awareness > expression > transformation) would enhance theoretical depth.

The sentence beginning with “In contrast, individuals with low emotional intelligence...” combines diverse coping strategies (e.g., emotional eating, social withdrawal) without referencing whether these were measured in the current study or related studies. Please clarify or limit generalization.

The phrase “all statistical assumptions were met” is reported without supporting statistical tests (e.g., Levene’s test, Shapiro-Wilk). Add numerical evidence or test statistics to justify this claim.

The standard error for “Job Stress” in the experimental group is reported as 0.097, which seems unusually small given the standard deviation (10.563). Please double-check calculations or clarify if this is a typographical error.

In Table 3, “Effect Size” is labeled generally, but the exact metric (likely partial eta squared) is not explicitly stated. Please clarify and provide interpretation benchmarks (e.g., small, medium, large).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.