



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_21052
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Neuronfeedback and drug therapy on ADHD children aged 5 to 14 and its impact on happiness of their mothers
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled, " Effectiveness of Neuronfeedback and drug therapy on ADHD children aged 5 to 14 and its impact on happiness of their mothers" is a cross-sectional study that compared the effectiveness of neurofeedback and drug therapy on ADHD children and investigated the impacts of these two intervention strategies on their mothers' happiness. The manuscript addresses a potentially important topic and has the potential to make a substantial contribution to the literature. My initial enthusiasm for this study waned, however, due to methodological problems that limit the generalizability of the primary findings. The paper was generally poorly written, with some confusing information. These and other concerns are described below by section. Title: The term "neurofeedback" was misspelled ("neuronfeedback"). Abstract: The background section should very briefly outline the following information: what is already known about the subject, related to the paper in question; and what is not known about the subject and hence what the study intended to examine. The authors only described the aim of the study, which is different from the title and methods ("children aged 5-15"). Introduction: This section is a bit confusing. There is not a clear link between the effectiveness of the intervention strategies and mother's happiness. The main objectives of the study are described in the middle of this section, which makes the understanding of the reader even more confused, since until this sentence only the neurofeedback	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	was described, and the explanation about drug therapy appear after the objectives. The authors have described the context properly, however the relevance of the problem and unclear issues are not evident. The last paragraph should of this section state the rationale, hypothesis, main objective, or purpose thus clearly identifying the hypothesis to be treated and the questions addressed in the manuscript. ADHD – the name of the disorder is Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (not “Attention deficit-hyper activity disorder”). The following sentence must be rewritten: “Attention deficit is the constant pattern of lack of attention or hyperactivity and usually is seen in children with similar developmental level.” This is the definition of ADHD, not only of the attention deficit (inattention); and the ADHD symptoms are more frequent and severe in these individuals than in healthy children with the same level of development. The second paragraph of the introduction mentions the developmental changes in the presentation of the symptoms throughout life, but there is no reference for this. I recommend the inclusion of Larsson H, Dilshad R, Lichtenstein P, Barker ED. Developmental trajectories of DSM-IV symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: genetic effects, family risk and associated psychopathology. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2011;52:954-63; and others studies that reported a general decline in hyperactivity-impulsivity symptoms across development and a general increase in inattentive symptoms, not simply state that the symptoms subside or disappear in adulthood. Acronyms should be fully explained when first used, see EMG (line 24 of the introduction). I wonder if it would be helpful to define the neurofeedback in general terms, and not only its application on ADHD.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 02, line 11 – Please fix “20 to 80”. Page 02, last paragraph - please fix the citation of Maslow. Material and Methods: There is not a clear presentation of the study design and the identification and description of the measurement parameters used to evaluate the purpose of the study. For example, on page 03, line 13 and 18, the authors mentioned the use of “Kafres’s hyperactivity with attention deficit questionnaire (revised form)”, but below they describe the use of Conners’ Rating Scale. I suggest that the authors describe the methodology using subtitles, such as: sample (with inclusion / exclusion criteria), measures, procedures, and statistical analysis. Other information about the sample characterization is also very important to understand the findings, such as medication (name, time of use), socio-economic status, sex, age (mean, median), comorbidities, etc. Treatment protocols for both neurofeedback and medication must be described. Results It is not clear how the authors compared the groups. What was the baseline? There were pre- and post-intervention assessments? Were comparisons calculated only inter-group and not intra-group? It was not described in methods section how the attention increase (are this levels of attention?) was assessed and calculated, probably they based that on Conner’s, but it is not clear. Discussion My main concern in this section is the interpretation of the findings comparing drug treatment and neurofeedback. In my view, without more specific information about the methods, it’s not possible to conclude that neurofeedback is more effective than medication, simply comparing individuals with the same diagnostic at one point on time, and considering the variability of individual responsiveness to each strategy. Also the authors should report the study	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	limitations, e.g. there is not a control group. It would be important to discuss the DSM criteria, since the authors used the fourth edition and the current version is the fifth. There are many sentences without references (ex. "This finding is consistent with previous studies" – which ones?). The authors state that "The results of this research showed that attention deficit in the two groups of ADHD children who had received neurofeedback or drug therapy was different after the treatment termination." – How long after the end of treatment was the assessment made? There are many misspelled words (e.g. "du=difficult", "parents-childe", "isd".	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of Sao Paulo, Brasil