

Paper: "Efficacy of Integrative Behavioural Couples Therapy and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy in Reducing Conflict and Violence-Related Marital Distress"

Corresponding Author: Stephen Doh Fia

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n20p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Oscar Esparza-Del Villar

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Oscar A. Esparza	Email:	
University/Country: Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez / México		
Date Manuscript Received: June 29, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 8, 2020	
Manuscript Title: EFFICACY OF INTEGRATIVE BEHAVIOURAL COUPLES THERAPY AND COGNITIVE BEHAVIOURAL THERAPY IN REDUCING CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE-RELATED MARITAL DISTRESS ESJ Manuscript Number: 99.06.2020		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes		

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(Please insert your comments) Yes, the title is clear and adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
(Please insert your comments) It is a good abstract. It would be better is the name and autinstruments used are not included here.	thors of the
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
(Please insert your comments) The document has an adequate grammar and spelling	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
 (Please insert your comments) He needs to explain how he assigned participants to that it is a quasi-experimental design, but there is no subjects were assigned. He needs to explain how long each of the 3 sessions He needs to evaluate the differences between the 3 ganalyses to verify what group differences are statist 	o mention how lasted. groups with posthoc
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
 The introduction, and other sections, should have so the content of the paragraph or paragraphs. The statistics in page 2, are from 1999-2002. He need with the most recent ones. In page 3, when explaining therapies, he needs to accommod explain the difference between CBT and IBCT, He needs to explain why ICBT is better than CBT. In the hypotheses, there is no mention of the control expect from it. The first paragraphs of the paper, and a few other independent of the control of	ds to be updated Id more references since it is not clear. I group and what to all the document,
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments) There is an opportunity to mention the cultural findings of would be of great benefit how couples reacted to this thera	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments) Maybe try to find some more recent studies, specifically of	the therapies.

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Overall a good study. There are only a few suggestions to make the paper stronger as indicated in the evaluation.