

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

Fabrice Dosseville<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Caen Basse Normandie

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

The paper delves into the relationship between anger and crime, discussing different perspectives on how anger contributes to criminal behavior. It then examines the prevalence of anger management programs in the United Kingdom's prisons and reviews recent meta-analyses on the effectiveness of these programs. The meta-analyses scrutinize the outcomes of various therapeutic interventions, with a particular emphasis on cognitive behavior therapy, and highlight the need for more comprehensive research. The text identifies a research gap, calling for quantitative methods and emphasizing the urgency of studying group-based anger management interventions. The conclusion reflects on the complexity of anger and the necessity of considering multiple factors contributing to recidivism, advocating for a holistic approach to offender rehabilitation.

My review will follow the basic structure identified by Qeios as Editorial Criteria. Please note that the following comments are not intended to degrade or break the spirit of the researchers, but are provided in an attempt to improve the quality of this work.

The topic of this study is both topical and worthy of investigation, and it is obvious that a lot of work and thought went into this paper.

After an introduction presenting the context and object of the present research, the authors refer to the implementation of anger management programs in the United Kingdom. The authors specify a percentage based on a source dating back more than 20 years. This reference seems far too old to me, and it may be that the weight of these programs has changed since 2002. However, the question of the effectiveness of such programs is pertinent. The authors cite a number of sources showing whether or not there is any interest in setting up anger management programs for an incarcerated public. I suggest that the authors elaborate on the results of these studies, giving more details on the tools used, the results obtained, the profile of the target audience... When authors wish to carry out a literature review or work on the basis of meta-analyses, a more structured procedure must be followed. Indeed, authors should explain and justify the methodology used to select the sources cited in their analysis. How were these studies and meta-analyses identified and selected? At present, the reader does not necessarily understand the purpose of this submission and the method used. This point is essential and clearly determines the interest of the paper submitted.

In the section on "recent meta-analyses," the reader may have the impression of reading a compilation of a few chronological works whose link with the problematic of the present paper is not so easy to find. Once again, authors must

clearly state their objective. Why mention studies on non-clinical, specifically psychiatric, or simply non-incarcerated populations?

Clearly, I suggest that authors:

- clearly define their objective by defining and discussing key terms,
- build a theoretical framework consistent with the objective,
- detail some of the work (as it stands, I consider that submitting an article based on the synthesis of meta-analyses has little added value).

The authors refer to the RADaR technique used recently. It is essential to develop this technique. They also indicate that using recidivism rates as an indicator of anger reduction is irrelevant. One would expect the authors to suggest some answers to this problem. This section is not a synthesis of the work, particularly on meta-analyses. I advise authors to categorize and structure their theoretical framework. The basis of the work remains the objective. This section is not a synthesis of the work, particularly on meta-analyses. I advise authors to categorize and structure their theoretical framework. The basis of the work remains the objective.

The conclusion seems to me to be partly disconnected from the work cited above. The last paragraph discusses the nature of anger, recidivism, the determinants of anger and aggression, and crime in general. But at the same time, what are the programs mentioned in this paper (duration, content, form, program...) and how do other determinants of crime emerge?

Finally, I am not an English native speaker myself, so I rather refuse to provide detailed corrections about language. However, I suggest that the authors reread their paper carefully. Indeed, there are sentences without conjugated verbs (e.g., in introduction "In particular, the focus on reforming offenders by reducing their innate aggression"), there are also several spelling mistakes that need to be corrected (e.g., "programmes"); a few formatting errors (e.g., "Lee & DiGiuseppe" in text whereas it should read "Lee and DiGiuseppe").