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**Length of Review** (see p. 2): *Range of 750 to 1,500 words for a review of a single video, NOT to exceed 2,000 words (excluding references). Reviews longer than 2,000 words will be returned immediately for shortening.* For a review of multiple videos, the range is 2,500 to 3,000 words.

**Content of the Review** (see p. 3): *Do not write scene-by-scene summaries! Reviews will be returned for revision if this approach is used.* Place the video in the context of the field. Discuss relevant literature, educational elements, technical elements, and limitation.

**Title Page for the Review** (see pp. 4, 7): See the Sample Review on page 7. Provide title page with review title, video citation information, reviewer name(s), and reviewer contact information.

**Abstract of Review for PsycINFO®** (see pp. 3, 9): Providing an abstract of your review for use in *PsycINFO®* is optional, but encouraged. An abstract should be one paragraph up to 250 words long.

**Addition of a Coreviewer** (see p. 2): *You must get approval from the Editorial Office to add a coreviewer, and the person invited to write the review must be the first author.* See the Guidelines for the allowed number of coreviewers and information about doctoral student coreviewers (must serve as second authors). *Only one video can be provided.*

**Deadline** (see p. 2): Our primary mission is to publish timely reviews, so take deadlines seriously. The standard due date is 30 days after you receive the video, unless otherwise arranged.

**Conflict of Interest** (see p. 3): If you have a potential conflict of interest, please contact the Editorial Office to discuss it before you write the review.

**Tables or Figures** (see p. 4): We don’t accept them.

**References** (see p. 4): *References must be in APA style. Please try to cite one to two articles especially relevant to the video,* and we suggest up to seven references for reviews of 2,000 words. APA will insert hyperlinks from your references to APA publications or other journals that provide online access.

**Biography of Reviewers** (see p. 4): Reviewers should provide a short biography (around 100 words or less) that will be linked to all of their published reviews. A photo (JPG or TIFF format) is optional but encouraged.

**Submitting Your Review** (see p. 6): *Be sure to format your review (see sample on p. 7)!* Submit the review through our Reviewer Portal at [http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/](http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/) (requires log in), or send it as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at PSQJournals@apa.org.

**Forms** (attached at end): *You must sign the Publication Rights form (sign in both Sections 1A and 2) and the Full Disclosure of Interests form.* Complete the other forms only if applicable. **We prefer forms scanned to PDF and e-mailed,** or they may be faxed to (202) 336-5549 (Attn. PsycCRITIQUES staff).
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*PsycCRITIQUES*® (the online continuation of *Contemporary Psychology: APA Review of Books*) publishes evaluative reviews of books and other materials of interest to psychologists. The quality of *PsycCRITIQUES*® depends on the quality of its reviews, so **please read these guidelines completely**. A set of forms is included with these guidelines.

### Length of Review

Video reviews should be between 900 and 1,500 words long, **NOT to exceed 2,000 words (excluding references)**. Reviews longer than 2,000 words will be returned immediately for shortening. The nature or complexity of a video may warrant a longer review, but this should be negotiated with the editorial office prior to submission.

### Deadline for the Review

Please take the deadline seriously. If *PsycCRITIQUES*® is to be of value to its readers, it is critical that reviews be published as soon as possible. **The standard deadline for video reviews is 30 days after receipt of the video.** If circumstances arise that would significantly delay your review, please notify the Editorial Office so as to determine if the video in question should be assigned to another reviewer.

### Addition of a Coreviewer and Number of Coreviewers

The authors whose works are reviewed in *PsycCRITIQUES*® expect the reviews to be written by their peers who are individuals with established credentials, and we appreciate your cooperation to ensure that this is so. Reviewers may solicit the assistance of a colleague or an advanced doctoral candidate in preparing the review. **The person recruited to do the review is expected to be the senior author, and the addition of a coauthor must be approved by the editorial office before the review is written.** Provide an email address, mailing address, and a brief description of the coauthor’s qualifications to assist with the review. **We reserve the right to refuse a review with coauthors who were not previously approved.**

### Doctoral Students as Coreviewers

**Doctoral students** are welcome to **serve as second authors** on reviews. We realize that student authors may sometimes do most of the work on a review; however, we purport that *PsycCRITIQUES*® offers genuine peer review. Reviews, unlike research articles, are not to present work for others to judge, but instead are critical evaluations that judge the work of others. We have set up a formal vetting process for our reviewers at the behest of the APA Publications & Communications Board. It dilutes the review and approval process if we abdicate responsibility for selecting the best possible reviewers and let students who have not been vetted take responsibility for the quality of the review.
Conflict of Interest (See Full Disclosure of Interests Form)

You must fill out and sign a Full Disclosure of Interests form. Occasionally, PsycCRITIQUES® will inadvertently invite a reviewer who may be perceived by the author(s) of the work and/or by the readers to have a conflict of interest that prevents an objective evaluation of the work. If for any reason you suspect that the perception of a conflict of interest may cast a shadow over your review, please contact the editorial staff to discuss before you begin the review. They will decide if it is appropriate for you to proceed with your review. We appreciate your sensitivity to this issue because it is impossible for our editors to know of all the conditions and circumstances that might lead readers to dismiss a review because of a perceived conflict of interest.

Write Abstract of Your Review for PsycINFO® (Optional)

If you wish to write an abstract that would be used for the PsycINFO® entry for your review, provide a single paragraph up to 250 words long (see sample, p. 9). It should be written in the third person, and active voice is preferred. Use words that you think readers would use in electronic searches. General information on writing an abstract is available in the APA Publication Manual (6th edition), section 2.04. Submitted abstracts may be edited by APA’s abstracting service; you will not be contacted, nor will you see the abstract before it is published. If you do not provide an abstract, APA will have one prepared by the abstracting service.

Content of the Review

A PsycCRITIQUES® educational video review should discuss the following aspects of the video (the percentage of the review devoted to each aspect is merely a rough guideline).

- **Clinical approach and applications** (30 to 35%). Discuss the therapy, intervention, theory, major tenets, clinical work, or the expert(s) interviewed and their approach. Discuss how the approach reflects the specialization and/or psychology as a whole; what are the clinical applications of the approach; compare/contrast related approaches. Quotes from the video may be used.

- **Scientific literature relevant to the approach** (30 to 35%). Include a discussion of literature of related approaches, if relevant, and of theory prior to the development of this approach.

- **Educational elements** (10 to 20%). Discuss the relevance of the approach to psychologists and/or particular specialties; assess whether the video reaches its intended audience.

- **Technical elements** (5 to 10%). Assess the quality of the video, whether the technical elements interfere or enhance the video, and the structure and set-up of the video (e.g., interview, session, Q & A, etc.).

- **Limitations** (10 to 20%). Discuss the limitations of the following: the expert’s approach (areas not covered, missing, or glossed over) and its application to the field, educational element of the video, and structure of the video.

From its inception, *Contemporary Psychology* (now PsycCRITIQUES®) has aspired to literary as well as scholarly excellence. The journal thus continues to adhere to the guidelines for reviewers set out by its first editor, E. G. Boring. Some of his “Comments to Reviewers” are reproduced below [for application and consistency purposes, minor changes in language for video reviews have been added].

*Contemporary Psychology* is a journal of critical reviews. It aspires to literary excellence... Primarily, the quality of this [journal] depends upon the reviewers’ skills.

*Contemporary Psychology* expects to publish value-judgments and criticism... even the short review may and should contain evaluations.

Good criticism requires tact, objectivity and a sense of good taste. Personal aspersions are taboo. Criticize the [video], the ideas, the logic, the accuracy, not the [expert featured in the video]. Let all criticism be *ad verbum*, never *ad hominem*. *CP* does not provide space for the discussion of the intelligence or integrity of the [expert]. Always try to see how nearly the [expert] has realized his [or her] own aspiration, whether you approve of the aspiration or not.

Do not abstract the [video]. Talk about it and in doing so indicate the range and nature of its content. Readers will not go to *CP* for [a summary of the video]. Indicate the [video’s] purpose, the way in which the [expert] seeks
to achieve the purpose and your estimate of his [or her] success. Compare the [video] with other [videos] of similar kind or intent. Place it in perspective in the contemporary psychology scene. Give it an historical perspective too, if that seems appropriate. A good review is critical, and a good critic needs all the scholarship he [or she] can command.

Address your review to the whole range of the readers of CP, not to your own special group. Let the expert in personality write to psychophysicists and to experts in animal learning. Let the physiological psychologist write to religious psychologists, historians, and statisticians…One of CP’s most important functions is to tell psychologists about one another.

**Format of the Review (see Sample Video Review, p. 7)**

**TITLE PAGE:**

**ALERT: You must format your review, including a title page, for it to be evaluated and edited.**

Provide a title page as the first page of your review that has the following information: review title, citation of the video reviewed, reviewer by-line, and a reviewer’s correspondence address.

**Title of the Review:** Please include a title for the review on the first page. It should call attention to some important point or critical comment in the review. It should be concise, interesting, and attention-getting.

**Citation of the Video:** Below the review title, provide a citation of the video under review that has the title, year released, featured researcher (if applicable), video series or producer, and price. The format should be as follows: *Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy for Depression*, with Zindel V. Segal, Ph.D. (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2005. American Psychological Association Psychotherapy Videotape Series VI, Item no. 4310716. $99.95)

**Correspondence Address:** Reviewer(s) must provide an affiliation and/or an address that will be published in the review where readers can send correspondence. Also provide an e-mail address (if available).

**SUBHEADINGS:**

If the review exceeds 1,000 words, the addition of subheadings is recommended to clarify its organization. A good rule of thumb is that a subheading should occur at 500-word intervals. If subheadings are added, *you must use at least two.*

**NO FIGURES OR TABLES:**

*PsycCRITIQUES®* does not accept any figures or tables.

**REFERENCES and FOOTNOTES:**

Footnotes within the main text should *not* be used. Regarding references, although reviews don’t require exhaustive documentation, we strongly encourage citation of at least one to two articles that relate to the video you are reviewing. In most cases, the following targets will be appropriate: two references for reviews of 750 words; seven references for reviews of 2,000 words; and up to 10 references for reviews (of multiple titles) of up to 3,000 words. In formatting references, you must use standard APA style as described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.).

As an online journal, we will add hypertext links for references when possible, in particular when the articles are APA publications available through *PsycNET*. The ability to use hyperlinks to quickly download relevant research will significantly enhance the value of your review.

**BIOGRAPHY OF REVIEWER(S):**

Reviewer(s) should provide a short biography (up to 100 words per biography), which will be linked to the review online. This biography can be submitted through the online Reviewer Portal described in the Submission section
(p. 6), or placed on the last page of the review. A digital photo (TIFF, JPG, or EPS format) may also be included, if desired. If you send a digital photo, please sign a Photo Permission form and send it in with your other forms.

Style Notes

QUOTATIONS:
Short quotations (40 words or less) are set off by double quotation marks; longer quotations are set off from the text as a freestanding block with no quotation marks. APA requires permission for a quotation that contains 400 or more consecutive words or 800 or more words of nonconsecutive text excerpts. Most scholarly publishers have adopted similar fair use guidelines; however, it is your responsibility to confirm the fair use guidelines for the relevant copyright holder to determine whether you need to secure permission (see Permissions Alert form). It is particularly important that all quotations conform exactly to the material in the book. The validity of an entire review may be called into question if it contains inaccurate quotations. Please double-check the accuracy of each quotation. Cite a page number at the end of every quotation.

Text inserted by the reviewer into a quotation (as a comment or to create complete, understandable sentences) should be contained in brackets, rather than in parentheses. Reviewers should specify when they have added italics by inserting [italics added] directly following the material emphasized.

LINGUISTIC CONVENTIONS:
PsycCRITIQUES® avoids sexist language. Please review the section on bias in language in the APA’s Publication Manual (6th edition) (pp. 70–77) before submitting reviews.

Avoid the use of titles (Dr., Prof., Mrs., Ms., etc.) with authors’ or editors’ names. A last name will usually suffice; however, first names should be given the first time a reference is made to a particular individual (e.g., Alfred Adler, Albert Bandura, Raymond Corsini).

COMBINED and COMPANION REVIEWS:
“Combined” reviews are invited when the Editors believe that PsycCRITIQUES® readers will benefit from having two or more videos or a video and book evaluated together, with comparisons and contrasts drawn where appropriate. We thus expect to receive in these cases one single review (rather than separate reviews for each item), with one title and of the approximate length suggested.

“Companion” reviews are invited when the editors believe that PsycCRITIQUES® readers will benefit by having a video reviewed by individuals from two different professional perspectives and/or areas of expertise. In these cases two separate reviews are solicited, with two different titles, and are published together.

Editorial Actions and Production Process

The policy of this journal is to request reviewers to evaluate substantive changes and respond to queries from the Editors or copyeditor. Editors may make minor changes (e.g., to improve clarity or conform to APA style) in manuscripts without informing the reviewer when deemed appropriate. Once accepted by an Editor for publication, your review will be sent to APA for copyediting. You will be contacted by APA only if copyediting changes are made that might risk altering the meaning of your text. You will have 48 hours to respond. Please keep your final copy of the review handy to refer to in this instance. If the copyeditor makes only standard changes for APA style, grammar, or punctuation, you will not see the review until it is published. No page proofs will be sent before publication.

It is PsycCRITIQUES’s policy that, prior to publication, no portion or description of the contents of a review are to be disclosed to either (a) the writers/directors/producers of the video or (b) any other third party (e.g. but not limited to, publicity agent).

PsycCRITIQUES Spotlight

The APA-sponsored PsycCRITIQUES Spotlight is located at www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/. The forum is publicly accessible. Once or twice a month the editors release a Spotlight based on a recent book, film, or video review. Reviewers are notified at the time of posting when their reviews are highlighted for discussion on the Spotlight.
Submitting Your Review

We appreciate your help in ensuring that your manuscript is sent to PsycCRITIQUES® in proper form. Please check the following:

1. Prepare the review as a Word document, and format your review, including a title page, as described on page 4 and illustrated in the Sample Review (p. 7). Double space the review.

2. Quotations must be accurate. Please check the final manuscript against the video to be certain that all quotations are typed exactly as they are spoken in the video. If quoting from a book, the quote must be followed by the page number(s) on which the quotes appears.

3. Submit review as follows: Go to http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/ to log in and submit your review. If you need log-in information, there is help available at this site, or contact the Editorial staff for assistance. Once logged in, choose from the Menu Options “Upload Reviews,” and then fill in the requested information and upload your review. The system will let you know if you successfully submit your review.

   Alternatively, you can send your review (and digital photo, if you choose to send one) as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at PSQJournals@apa.org.

4. Submit forms as follows: The following forms must be signed by all authors and submitted before the review can be sent on to APA. Forms can be scanned as a PDF and submitted as an e-mail attachment, or faxed to (202) 336-5549 (or mailed to the address listed at the top of the Guidelines, if either of these options is not convenient):

   - APA Publication Rights form, signed in sections 1A and 2;
   - Full Disclosure of Interests form, signed;
   - If applicable: (a) the Photo Permission form, if you send a digital photo to include with your biography; and (b) the Permissions Alert form plus letters granting permission to use copyrighted material. Your manuscript cannot be published without these letters.

---

REVIEW SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

☐ Formatted review, with title page
☐ Electronic file of review as a Word document
☐ Reviewer biography
☐ APA Publication Rights form (signed in Sections 1A and 2)
☐ Full Disclosure of Interests form
☐ Additional forms, if applicable
☐ Abstract of review (optional)

Reviewer Portal: http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/
Editorial staff: PSQJournals@apa.org
Fax: (202) 336-5549 (Attn: PsycCRITIQUES staff)
Sample Video Review With Title Page

Not Letting Go

A review of the video
Behavioral Therapy Over Time
with Martin M. Antony
Psychotherapy Video Series VIII, Item No. 4310870. $399.00

Reviewed by Marcia McCabe

Marcia McCabe  <<contact information including e-mail address>>

[Start your review on new page.]
[Single spacing of sample review is to save space. Your review should be double spaced.]

Compulsive hoarding, characterized by the acquisition of, and failure to discard, a large number of possessions that appear to be useless or of limited value, resulting in the taking over of living spaces and dysfunction or distress (Frost & Hartl, 1996), is a puzzling and often debilitating disorder. Compulsive hoarding aggregates in families, and recent research indicates that at least half of this familiality is due to genetic factors (at least in women), with the remaining variance accounted for by nonshared environmental factors and measurement error, as described by Iervolino et al. (2009). In this large, recent twin study, 4 percent of men and 2 percent of women met criteria for compulsive hoarding, indicating that it is not rare in the general population.

Hoarding is currently most closely identified with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD); approximately 30 percent of those with OCD endorse hoarding obsessions and compulsions (Frost, Krause, & Steketee, 1996), and many researchers consider it as a subtype of OCD. However, hoarding behavior is observed in a number of psychiatric and neurological disorders, and even in nonclinical populations, contributing to ongoing nosological controversy (Pertusa et al., 2008; Steketee & Frost, 2003). OCD patients who hoard tend to have more severe impairment and greater psychiatric comorbidity (Frost, Steketee, Williams, & Warren, 2000; Lochner et al., 2005), as well as evidence of poorer response to standard treatments, behavioral or pharmacological, for OCD (Abramowitz, Franklin, Schwartz, & Furr, 2003; Steketee & Frost, 2003).

In addition, OCD patients who hoard metabolize cerebral glucose differently than do nonhoarding OCD patients (Saxena et al., 2004) and may have discrete susceptibility genes (Samuels et al., 2007; Saxena, 2007), suggesting that hoarding may be a distinct clinical syndrome. There is growing suggestion that a cognitive-behavioral approach, specifically designed for the clinical features of hoarding, has promise for treating this difficult disorder (Hartl & Frost, 1999; Tolin, Frost, & Steketee, 2007).

As part of the APA series Psychotherapy in Six Sessions, Martin Antony demonstrates behavioral therapy with Helen, a woman in her mid-50s who suffers from compulsive hoarding. In the DVD Behavioral Therapy Over Time, Antony meets with Helen during six 45-minute sessions, each followed with commentary during an interview with Jon Carlson. In presession discussions with Carlson, Antony makes clear that he views cognitive strategies as a fundamental aspect of his approach, citing the cognitive revolution as the second wave of development of the behavioral model. Given the degree of Antony’s attention to identifying and changing the dysfunctional cognition that underlies Helen’s difficulties, many would characterize his treatment approach as cognitive behavioral.

Antony presents several foci for treatment strategies: (a) the inability to discard items, (b) excessive acquisition of items, and (c) perfectionism and indecisiveness. Helen is a well-chosen subject for showing the emotions, thoughts, cognitive deficits, behaviors, and lifestyle problems that characterize compulsive hoarding,
and her case is fairly severe in nature. Helen is unemployed, bankrupt, and lives alone. Her home is so cluttered with objects and piles that she cannot have visitors; even her children do not come to see her in her home. She has pathways to get from room to room, and her access to laundry and cooking is obstructed by clutter. Her bedroom is so full of things that she can barely enter the threshold to the room, and she does not sleep there. Her social engagement and participation in life beyond her home and shopping are limited.

As a good behaviorist should, Antony begins with assessment and provides a clear, transparent rationale for his treatment strategies. The viewer learns the extent of Helen’s impairment, her general difficulty with decision making, and some of the thoughts that keep her from letting go of items. Antony discusses homework and gives Helen a client guide to hoarding that she finds very helpful as treatment progresses.

Antony later introduces a visualization exercise, having Helen first imagine a room at its worst and then free of excessive clutter. Through this exercise, Antony has Helen identify attendant thoughts and feelings, and begin to label thoughts as thoughts. This is the beginning of Helen becoming a more effective observer of her own subjective experiences and of the possibility of decentering from problematic thoughts and behavioral responses.

Antony is excellent in his portrayal of an accepting but focused approach and in his skillful use of Socratic questioning to help Helen identify critical stuck points in her thoughts and behaviors. A fascinating aspect of hoarding is the lack of insight that many hoarders show about their problem. This issue is strikingly apparent in interactions in which Antony voices the dilemma of Helen wanting freedom from her clutter but also wanting to keep all of her things. As if for the first time, Helen seems to grasp the irreconcilable nature of these two desires.

As treatment continues, Antony introduces behavioral experiments around discarding such as having Helen bring in a basket of items and assisting her in developing a system for decision making, including adopting the mindset of a nonhoarder during discarding. He helps her weigh the definite cost of keeping all of her items against the possible use that she could find for items in the future. Experiments around reducing excessive acquiring are also introduced, such as having Helen go to a store and buy only one item she needs, something she has not done before. The experiments generate anxiety in Helen, and Antony helps her see that she can tolerate degrees of anxious feeling and still act in accordance with her goals.

This DVD is a valuable example of a behavioral approach to a difficult clinical problem. It excels in demonstrating some of the defining aspects of this model, including a behavioral definition of the problem, the collaborative and active nature of the therapist–client relationship, Socratic questioning, and the importance of homework for creating changes in thought and behavior. The viewer also sees a specific conceptualization for the problem of hoarding.

It is useful to see that “not every session is a good session,” even for a seasoned clinician such as Antony. In addition, the interactions between Helen and Antony also show the importance of a good therapeutic relationship, as this aspect of therapy is too often not recognized as an important aspect of the behavioral model. The DVD does not provide detailed information on the research and clinical literature of the disorder, but this is not set forth as a goal of the video. Antony explains that his usual treatment of hoarding involves longer sessions, home visits, and an extended number of sessions. The usual outcome involves improvement but not resolution of the disorder.

At the end of this video, I am left feeling that a visitor to Helen’s home would not be able to see much in the way of actual differences and would think that, as Antony says, there is much more work to do. However, in watching Helen through the sessions, I saw an increase in awareness and hopefulness, and seeds of behavioral change have been planted. Helen makes clear that, for her, these are no small things.
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Example Abstract for PsycINFO®

Reviews the video, Behavior therapy over time, with Martin M. Antony (2009). Compulsive hoarding, characterized by the acquisition of, and failure to discard, a large number of possessions that appear to be useless or of limited value, resulting in the taking over of living spaces and dysfunction or distress, is a puzzling and often debilitating disorder. As part of the APA series Psychotherapy in Six Sessions, Antony demonstrates behavioral therapy with a woman in her mid-50s who suffers from compulsive hoarding. He begins with assessment and provides a clear, transparent rationale for his treatment strategies. The viewer learns the extent of the client’s impairment, her general difficulty with decision making, and some of the thoughts that keep her from letting go of items. This DVD is a valuable example of a behavioral approach to a difficult clinical problem.