

# Review of: "PSYCHOLOGICAL win-win-win"

Aldo Toledo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

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

In this manuscript, the author aimed to contribute to the validation of a measure of the negotiation phenomenon. Therefore, he asked participants to respond to six items from a negotiation scale, each of which had five response options: I strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and I totally agree. The author calculated six chi-square analyses—one for each item—in which he observed the distribution of the participants' responses in each item among the response options. Although these observations may be interesting, the manuscript presents several problems, which I list below:

- The manuscript should follow the structure suggested by the Manual of the American Psychological Association (2019): Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion. The Introduction section should include a definition of negotiation, its "modalities" (e.g., win-win and win-win-win), the previously reported scales to measure negotiation, and the purpose of the study. The Method section should include the following sections: participants, instruments, procedure, and data analysis. The Results section should include the main results of the study, not several tables that difficult the reading of the manuscript. The Discussion section is an evaluation of the purpose of the study: was this purpose reached? Additionally, it should include commonalities and differences in comparison with other studies, interpretations of the findings of the study, and further research suggested by the data presented.
- The definition of negotiation seems unclear. That is, the author mentioned that "all individuals negotiate everyday in all areas...", but it is not clear how this social behavior is. A description of negotiation is partially given in the fourth paragraph of the "Analysis" section, which should be declared at the beginning of the manuscript.
- It seems unclear what win-win and win-win-win negotiations are. That is, these concepts seem to refer to a negotiation in which all parties receive a benefit. However, how is the interaction among the parties in the negotiation? Additionally, in the second paragraph of the "Introduction" section, the author mentioned that "we differentiate the initial negotiation of TWO into a negotiation of three". Did he mean two or three "people"? Clarifying these details may improve the descriptions of the phenomena described.
- In the third paragraph of the "Analysis" section, the author declared that he calculated an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in his first experiment and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in his second experiment. Nevertheless, he presented chi-square analyses for only the six items. Chi-square analysis is commonly used to explore the relation between two categorical variables; in this study, these two variables are the item tested (e.g., "You only consider personal gain") and the response option (i.e., "I totally disagree", "Disagree", etc.). These chi-square analysis illustrate the distribution of the participants' responses in each item among the five response options (comparing the observed with the expected results), which is interesting, but is far from the purpose previously declared in this study. Actually, factor analysis (a reduction-of-dimensions method) is not pertinent using only three items in Experiment 1 and three

items in Experiment 2.

- As previously pointed out, the author should not include several tables and calculations along the text. Tables such as the sex, age, educational level of the participants or the critical values are unnecessary. Only the main results should be clearly reported. Additionally, each table must be named as Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, etc., and referred to within the text (i.e., “As shown in Table 1, it can be observed...”).
- Although the author mentions the relationship of negotiation with psychoanalytic psychotherapy, it is not relevant for the purpose of the manuscript. I recommend to remove the psychoanalytic references, since the article uses statistical methods. Maybe, the psychoanalytic literature might be mentioned at the end of the Discussion section as a potential application of the negotiation methods, but no more.