

# Review of: "Does Anger Management Among Prisoners Work? — A Review of Recent Meta-Analyses"

Magnus Sjögren<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Umea University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript titled "Does Anger Management Among Prisoners Work? — A Review of Recent Meta-Analyses" by B. Preethi Meena Meena discusses the effectiveness of anger management programs in reducing recidivism among prisoners. The author reviews various recent meta-analyses on the topic, highlighting the debate over the effectiveness of these programs. The manuscript covers the impact of anger on crime, the role of different types of anger management programs, and the gaps in current research, especially in non-Western contexts. It concludes that while anger management programs have some effectiveness, a comprehensive understanding of crime causation requires considering factors beyond anger.

## Major Weaknesses:

1. Selection of Meta-Analyses: The manuscript focuses on a limited range of meta-analyses, potentially overlooking others that could provide a broader understanding (Introduction & Recent Meta-Analyses sections).

The manuscript references Henwood et al. (2015) and Lee & DiGiuseppe (2018) but does not critically examine their methodologies or limitations (Section: Recent Meta-Analyses).

2. Methodological Analysis: There is insufficient critique of the methodologies used in the included meta-analyses, which could impact the validity of the conclusions drawn (Recent Meta-Analyses section).

3. Regional Bias: The paper heavily references studies from Western countries, which may not accurately represent global perspectives and results (Research Gap section).

4. Lack of Detail on Anger Management Programs: Specific details about the types of anger management programs evaluated in the meta-analyses are not comprehensively discussed, which could provide more nuanced insights into their effectiveness (Recent Meta-Analyses section).

5. Overreliance on Recidivism as an Outcome Measure: The manuscript predominantly uses recidivism as the outcome measure for the effectiveness of anger management programs, neglecting other potential benefits or impacts (Research Gap section).

6. It acknowledges the need for more diverse studies but doesn't integrate this aspect into its analysis (Section: Research

Gap).

7. Limited Practical Implications (p. 5): The manuscript concludes with broad observations but does not offer specific, actionable recommendations for policy or practice in the context of anger management programs.

#### Discussion

8. Generalized Conclusions: The discussion often makes broad generalizations about the effectiveness of anger management programs without adequately addressing variations in program design and implementation (p. 5).

9. Lack of Critical Evaluation: There is a limited critical analysis of the methodologies of the meta-analyses reviewed, which could impact the validity of the conclusions drawn (p. 6).

10. Insufficient Consideration of Cultural Differences: The manuscript does not adequately address how cultural differences may affect the effectiveness of anger management programs, an important factor in a global context (p. 7).

11. Overemphasis on Quantitative Data: The discussion heavily relies on quantitative data from meta-analyses and may overlook qualitative aspects that could provide deeper insights (p. 8).

12. Limited Scope for Future Research: The section does not sufficiently identify specific areas for future research, which is crucial for advancing the field (p. 9).

There are several language errors, both grammatical and spelling, that need to be corrected.