

Review of: "?????????????"

Guanghui Huang¹

¹ Macau University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

I have carefully reviewed the article and would like to commend the authors for their dedication to their research subject. However, as a psychologist with a focus on rigorous experimental design and comprehensive reporting, I would like to address a couple of concerns that I believe could enhance the validity and reliability of the study's findings.

Firstly, the issue of subgrouping without a control group raises a significant question about the foundation of the study's evidence. The inclusion of a control group, or at the very least a comparison group that does not undergo the experimental manipulation or avoids the key elements of the experiment, is paramount for establishing a baseline for comparison. This would allow for a clearer interpretation of the effect size and the causal relationship between the intervention and the observed outcomes. Without this, it becomes challenging to attribute any observed changes solely to the elements of the experiment, as there may be other confounding variables at play. I would recommend the authors consider revising the study design to incorporate a control group to bolster the evidence base for their conclusions.

Moving on to the second issue regarding the conclusion section, science thrives on a balanced representation of all data, both positive and negative. It is crucial for the integrity of the research that the conclusions drawn reflect the full spectrum of findings. This includes discussing not only the successes but also any null results or unexpected outcomes. Reporting negative results is not a sign of failure but rather a hallmark of thorough and unbiased research. It provides a more realistic appraisal of the intervention's efficacy and can offer valuable insights for future research directions. I suggest the authors revisit their conclusion section to ensure that it accurately encapsulates all facets of their data, thereby enhancing the transparency and utility of the work.

In closing, addressing these issues could greatly improve the robustness of the study and contribute more substantially to the field. The pursuit of knowledge is a collaborative and iterative process, and I believe these modifications can help propel this research to its fullest potential.

Respectfully,