

# Peer Review Comments

**Article:** Bourassa, K. J., Tackman, A. M., Mehl, M. R., & Sbarra, D. A. (2019). Psychological Overinvolvement, Emotional Distress, and Daily Affect Following Marital Dissolution. *Collabra: Psychology*, 5(1): 8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.184>

**Article type:** Original Research Report

**Editor:** Rebecca Schlegel

**Article submitted:** 17 July 2018

**Editor decision:** Accept Submission

**Revision submitted:** 28 November 2018

**Article accepted:** 17 December 2018

**Article published:** 24 January 2019

---

## Responses for Version 1

Reviewer G:

### 1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

The overall methodology is appropriate for the research questions, and strengths of the study are the multimethod approach and preregistered analyses. However, I have concerns about the clarity, measurement, and operationalization of constructs. Overinvolvement is measured with three different variables (self-reported rumination, verbal immediacy, and coded recounting/reconstruing), but a stronger theoretical/empirical rationale for why each of these assessments measures overinvolvement (or facets of overinvolvement) is needed particularly for the recounting/reconstruing variable as this is not defined/explained well. Explaining this in the introduction would be helpful. This could be done when discussing how overinvolvement was measured in a prior study given that rumination and verbal immediacy were a part of that composite. More information on how rumination is related to overinvolvement may aid in the interpretation of the findings.

As noted in the manuscript the reliability of the measure of overinvolvement is quite low. It is not clear that overinvolvement is being measured adequately, and therefore it is difficult to interpret the results especially in light of the previous comment.

The description of social behavior in the introduction is quite broad and does not align with how it is

measured in the study. In the introduction, the description of social behavior relies heavily on social support, but social support is not measured. Social behavior is also referred to as social engagement, but it is unclear how all the variables measured by the EAR assess social engagement. There is not a clear rationale for why these variables were picked as potential explanatory variables. It seems that many of these variables are reflective of psychological adjustment rather than predictors of adjustment (e.g., laughing, crying, and talking about an ex-partner maybe reflective of trait rumination – what is the correlation between the two?), and laughing and crying are behaviors that are both done in the presence of others and alone. Time alone and the type of conversation directly assess social engagement.

What was the rationale for the decision to focus on actigraphy only and not examine self-reported sleep diaries?

More information is needed regarding the actigraphy – what threshold and epoch length were used? What rules were used for scoring the data?

What were the correlations between rumination and the mediators?

## 2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here):

I may have missed it, but I did not see a note regarding where to find the data. I would like to see which associations are statistically significant in the correlation table. The figures were redundant with the table and I believe there were some rounding/reporting mistakes in them (e.g. psychological distress  $\beta = .10$  in the table, .11 in the figure; sadness  $\beta = .34$  in the table, .35 in the figure; happiness – the unstandardized estimate appears to be reported in the figure instead of the standardized one)

## 3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required:

A statement of IRB approval and declaration of informed consent should be added to the procedure section. Type of compensation should also be included.

#### 4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process.:

There is a bit of jargon used in the manuscript that makes some of the arguments/explanations difficult to understand. For example, the term "meaning making" is referenced quite a bit, but a definition of this process and explicitly how it relates to adjustment is not provided. "Path A" from a mediation model is referenced in the discussion, but many readers may not be familiar with mediation models. Overall the clarity of the writing could be improved. For example, in the abstract, the description of psychological involvement as "assessed using a composite of three methodologies" is unclear before reading the manuscript, and the sentence "Exploratory analyses suggested that self-reported rumination primarily accounted for the association between overinvolvement and the three outcomes" reads as if rumination was explored as a possible mediator when it was not explored in that way. The sentence "...it is possible that changes in people's living situation, sleeping patterns, or well-being could impact people's adjustment to marital dissolution" was a confusing start to the sleep paragraph because only sleep was discussed in the paragraph. The sleep quality paragraph in the introduction needs more information about the indices of sleep that are being measured. Sleep efficiency is mentioned in the hypotheses, but it is not defined. It should be made clear that sleep quality is measured objectively and subjective sleep quality is not measured. The limitations of the prior study and how this study addresses those limitations are not clearly articulated. Using specific methodological terminology could be helpful (e.g., cross-sectional, retrospective rather than "broad self-report"; outcomes measured daily rather than "proximal outcomes"). Finally, please edit for typos.

-----

-----

Reviewer L:

#### 1) General comments and summary of recommendation

Describe your overall impressions and your recommendation, including changes or revisions. Please note that you should pay attention to scientific, methodological, and ethical soundness only, not novelty, topicality, or scope. A checklist of things to you may want to consider is below:

- Are the methodologies used appropriate?
- Are any methodological weaknesses addressed?
- Is all statistical analysis sound?
- Does the conclusion (if present) reflect the argument, is it supported by data/facts?
- Is the article logically structured, succinct, and does the argument flow coherently?
- Are the references adequate and appropriate?:

My overall impression was very positive. The authors were clear, thorough, and demonstrated a well-designed and well-analyzed project.

#### 2) Figures/tables/data availability:

Please comment on the author's use of tables, charts, figures, if relevant. Please acknowledge that adequate underlying data is available to ensure reproducibility (see open data policies per discipline of Collabra here):

I was satisfied with figure/data availability.

3) Ethical approval:

If humans or animals have been used as research subjects, and/or tissue or field sampling, are the necessary statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.

If not, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement/follow-up is required:

I approve.

4) Language:

Is the text well written and jargon free? Please comment on the quality of English and any need for improvement beyond the scope of this process:

I approve.

---

## Editor Decision for Version 1

**Editor:** Rebecca Schlegel

**Affiliation:** Texas A&M University, US

**Editor decision:** Revisions Required

**Decision date:** 23 October 2018

Dear kyle J Bourassa,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration by Collabra. First, I want to apologize for the delay in getting this decision letter to you. As you know from our previous communication, I had some trouble in finding reviewers in a timely manner for this manuscript. However, I am happy to report that I do now have two reviews of your manuscript from highly qualified researchers with specific expertise in relationship science. I thank them for their service to this journal. I also independently read the manuscript before consulting these reviews.

As you will see, the reviewers were mixed in their reactions to this paper. One reviewer did not recommend it for acceptance, but the other did. My read of the paper is somewhere between these two reviewers. I share many of reviewer 1's concerns, but I am optimistic they can be addressed through revision. As such I am inviting you to revise this work per the suggestions raised by reviewer 1 (note reviewer 2 does not have any explicit suggestions). In general, I want to commend your commitment to transparency and the thoroughness in the reporting of your results. I also thought you discussed the results with appropriate nuance given the somewhat "messy" nature of the findings. The major

issues have to do with clarifying the theorizing that led to picking these particular variables/ operationalizations and a better match between the results and the focus of the general discussion. Reviewer 1 articulates all of these concerns nicely in their review (indeed they captured all the concerns I had independently jotted down along with a couple others I didn't catch).

Thank you for submitting to Collabra and I look forward to receiving your revision.

The full review information should be included at the bottom of this email. There may also be a copy of the manuscript file with reviewer comments available once you have accessed the submission account.

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:

- 1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
- 2) click on the submission title
- 3) click 'Review' menu option
- 4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
- 5) upload the edited file
- 6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, and that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload. Please also ensure that all copyright permissions have been obtained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us.

Please could you have the revisions submitted by November 20th. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr Rebecca Schlegel

Texas A&M University

[schlegelrj@gmail.com](mailto:schlegelrj@gmail.com)

---

## Author's Response to Review Comments for Version 1

**Author:** Kyle Bourassa, M.A.

**Affiliation:** University of Arizona, US

**Revision submitted:** 28 November 2018

Dear Dr. Schlegel:

We are pleased to resubmit the manuscript, "Psychological Overinvolvement, Emotional Distress, and Daily Affect Following Marital Dissolution" (authors: Kyle J. Bourassa, Allison M. Tackman, Matthias R. Mehl, and David A. Sbarra) for consideration of publication in Collabra.

We have taken many steps to improve the manuscript, which are described in detail within our "Response to Decision Letter" document. All revisions have their changes referenced by page and marked in the manuscript with colored text for ease of further review by you and the reviewers, though we would be happy to provide additional or alternative markup for changes if desired. We thank you and the reviewers for the detailed and thoughtful feedback.

The research reported here is not published elsewhere, nor is the work under consideration at other outlets. All four authors are affiliated with the Department of Psychology at the University of Arizona. All authors have reviewed and approved of the submitted manuscript. As corresponding author, please contact me with any questions regarding this manuscript (email: [kylebourassa@email.arizona.edu](mailto:kylebourassa@email.arizona.edu), cell: 860-208-9894, fax: 520-621-9306, or the following mailing address: Department of Psychology, 1503 E. University Blvd., Bldg #68, Tucson, AZ, 85721).

Thank you for considering our work.

Sincerely,

Kyle Bourassa, M.A.

Graduate Student

Department of Psychology

University of Arizona

**Attached document:**

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/ubiquity-partner-network/ucp/journal/collabra/184-2578-1-SP.docx>

---

---

## Editor Decision for Version 2

**Editor:** Rebecca Schlegel

**Affiliation:** Texas A&M University, US

**Editor decision:** Accept Submission

**Decision date:** 17 December 2018

Dear Kyle J Bourassa,

I have now read through your revision and response letter. I think you handled all the issues raised nicely and I am happy to accept your submission for publication, pending the completion of copyediting and formatting processes.

As there are no further reviewer revisions to make, you do not have to complete any tasks at this point. The accepted submission will now undergo final copyediting. You will be contacted once this is complete to answer any queries that may have arisen during copyediting and to allow a final chance to edit the files prior to typesetting. If you wish to view your submission during this time, you can log in via the journal website.

Kind regards,

Dr Rebecca Schlegel

Texas A&M University

[schlegelrj@gmail.com](mailto:schlegelrj@gmail.com)