

# Review of: "A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Psychotherapeutic Approaches for Recurring Nightmares"

Chris Penlington<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Newcastle University

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

This paper is nicely written and provides a good introduction on psychological treatments for nightmares that occur within or outside of PTSD diagnoses. It follows recommended steps for a meta-analysis with quality assessments included as part of the methodology and reports a systematic and replicable search of the literature. However it lacks necessary detail in reporting of the results and it is not clear why the protocol included in the methodology was not followed. More detail would be needed for the article to add to the existing knowledge base.

## Introduction

The introduction overall is comprehensive and well-written. Given that the authors refer to a meta-analysis (Schagen et al 2020) that was carried out on the topic recently they should explain how the current review aims to add to or expand on the findings that were reported in this review. Likewise there is a 2022 systematic review in Clinical Psychology Review by Sheaves et. al which the authors should reference and indicate how their own review differs from this review and adds to its' findings.

## Methodology

This is written as if in the future tense and should be adjusted now that the work has been completed.

## Effectiveness of psychotherapeutic approaches

This section is very short given that in the methodology section the plan appears to have been to compare therapeutic modalities against each other. In the results it is not clear what the modalities have been compared against – no treatment, control, other active treatment condition or simply uncontrolled pre to post comparison. This needs to be more clearly explained.

Results of a meta-analytic comparison of one psychotherapeutic modality against another either need to be presented or an explanation given as to why they were not conducted as per protocol.

Subgroup analyses that indicated differences are reported but the article does not report which subgroup analyses were carried out. The reporting style therefore does not allow for a judgement about the relevance of what is reported or awareness of other null effects that might have been found. Overall there is far more detail needed within the results section.

The risk of bias again is not described in enough detail to contextualise the results. Risk of bias would usually appear further up in a results section.