

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 6 th September 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 8 th September 2017
Manuscript Title: High Trait Anger, Interpersonal Context, and the Recognition of Anger Problems	
ESJ Manuscript Number: No manuscript number provided. Alcazar-Olan, et al	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title does reflect the main objective of the study.	5
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. Whilst the authors stated the relevance of the recognition of anger traits and the objective of the study, the methods used and procedure carried out is not clearly described. There are some minor mistakes in the use of present and past tense. This makes difficult understanding where the authors are describing the literature and/or when they are reporting the results. It would be important stating the sample size and research design used. Authors need to be clearer when stating the results of the study (i.e., “Findings revealed” rather than “As a result, individuals...”)	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. There were only minor mistakes found in the abstract in terms of the verb-tense used as noted in box 2.	5

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>Participants, measures and data-analysis procedures were clearly explained. However, it may be important to clarify what the first sample was used for –given that in the second and final sample (n=192), it is clear that they were recruited because they met the inclusion criteria of “high trait anger”. Why did the authors then, recruit 843 participants in first instance? It would be wise to include the inclusion criteria specifying that –I am speculating- from a pool of participants (n=843), 192 were selected because they reported higher trait anger.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<p>Overall, the manuscript is adequate. The authors just need to address the abovementioned issues.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the discussion section, the authors state: <i>“As a result, people who recognize their anger problems perceived they have received more messages of “You are very irascible,” while those who do not recognize them have received these messages less often (Hypothesis 1),”</i> It would be important to analyse and/or clarify the directionality (if any) the authors suggest. This statement suggest that individuals aware of anger problems received more messages (alternatively, because I know I have anger problems I pay more attention to messages of this type. There must be research with regards to perception and attention focus), however it could be argued that because these individuals received more messages they could recognize their anger problems (which is the HI of this study). It may seem a word-puzzle, however, the focus must be placed on the directionality. The recommendation is to analyse this and include it in this section. There are some paragraphs which may need empirical support: • <i>“Probably, the recognition has an interactional component, where the individual is more open or receptive to messages from a significant other.”</i> I would suggest finding a reference to support this idea. • <i>“Third, this study relied on self-reports, which may not correspond to actual feelings and behaviors. Nevertheless, this strategy is appropriate to assess internal states like anger”</i> I would suggest finding a reference to support the bolded idea. • <i>“For example, if the person belongs to a negative, hostile environment, anger might be a natural or appropriate reaction. In these cases, anger might be a natural consequence or a solution, not a problem.”</i> I would suggest finding a reference to support this idea(s). • Whilst the authors did recognize the lack of validity of the “Involvement with Significant Others Scale”, I would recommend highlighting the potential first step to validate –in future- this scale. This study could serve as a base-line for future research focusing on the validation of such scale. • <i>“Therefore, conclusions derived from this measure are only preliminary, although results from this measure are consistent with a wider literature on anger research”</i> What other research? Please include some references • <i>“Sixth, recognizing anger problems does not necessarily lead to seek for psychotherapy to overcome these issues. Other factors and motivational processes may act on the decision to become involved in a psychological treatment.”</i> Why was this a limitation? Psychotherapy was not the focus of the study –not even associated with anger recognition or mentioned within the 	

literature review/introduction. I would remove this limitation.

Whilst there are interesting limitations shared by the authors, unfortunately they outweigh the findings of the study. The findings of this study are truly important, why did not you discuss them more broadly? The article would benefit from including additional links with previous research. This is to say, discuss the findings in more depth, linking it with previous empirical studies. The authors focused on stating the findings, however no potential explanations (regarding what they observed) were given.

Whilst discussing in more depth the hypothesis, -and more importantly the findings-, the analysis would benefit from stating the implications of such findings at theoretical, methodological, social and practical level. For instance, what is the contribution of this study/findings to the field of psychology and anger recognition/management/treatment? It seems that the authors recognized and focused more on the limitations of the study than the relevant results they obtained. Show off your findings!

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

4

Overall, the references were interesting. Just one minor recommendation to the authors with regards to outdated references. Whilst they can certainly make use of seminal or classical work done in this field (e.g., Averill, 1983, Smith et al 1992 etc.), the authors should consider that there could be more recent research in this regard and which can be used to support their analysis/literature review.

There are minor mistakes in the use of the APA format: (Deffenbacher, Filetti et al., 2003) and (Deffenbacher, Lynch et al., 2003).

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Undoubtedly, this topic is relevant in the current literature and certainly, anger-related topics must be researched given its importance associated with personality disorders and more importantly with well-being. This is a good paper which could be published, however, there are some minor mistakes which the authors must address. Finally, it seems that the limitations outweighed the findings of the authors – diminishing the value of the paper. The authors must balance out this issue and indeed, show what they found and highlight its relevance to the field.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editor

Undoubtedly, this topic is relevant in the current literature and certainly, anger-related topics must be researched given its importance associated with personality disorders and more importantly with well-being. I would recommend this manuscript for publication in the European Scientific Journal provided the authors address the above mentioned comments. Please feel free to send me the amended version for review.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Angel Urbina-Garcia,

BA (Hons), MPsych., PhD., MBPsS., AFHEA

Programme Director Postgraduate Taught Programmes

University of Hull | Cottingham Road | HU6 7RX

Graduate Member British Psychological Association

Associate Member American Psychological Association

Email: M.Urbina-Garcia@hull.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 01482 463019

