IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 15 · Issue 3 · e100532

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effectiveness of Educating Program on Knowledge, Attitude, and Performance of Primary School Teachers Toward Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Firoozeh Derakhshanpour, Maryam Azarakhsh, Mohammadali Vakili, somayeh ahmadabadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Dec 2019	16 May 2021	6 Jul 2021	10.5812/ijpbs.100532

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Rozita Davari-Ashtiani, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

3 comments · 18 May 2020 – 3 Jul 2020

Rozita Davari-Ashtiani Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 18 May 2020

- The title does not describe the aim of the study. It is better to write: The efficacy of an educational workshop program on Knowledge, Attitude and Performance of Primary School Teachers toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

- In the abstract, the sample size is estimated to be 192 participants (32×6), while in the methods section, the number of teachers who took part in the workshops is 144. Another issue is: how could they evaluate the performance of teachers in dealing with children with ADHD in such a short period of time?

- Introduction: The fifth paragraph is not clear in terms of English writing. In the last paragraph, the third line is not easily understood.

There are at least two other studies that were conducted in Tehran on this issue, and one of them is a clinical trial. It is important to mention them in this article: (Comparison of Effect of Workshop and Training Package Teaching Methods on Changing Primary School Teachers' Knowledge and Attitudes toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
Mojgan Khademi, Niloofar Safai, Simasadat Noorbakhsh Rozita Davari Ashtiani and Leili Panaghi)

Investigating the knowledge and attitude of primary school teachers in Tehran towards Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity and Learning Disorders and their relation to teacher's characteristics (Nina salamatbakhsh et al)

- Method: The determination of the sample size is unclear.

- Results: They showed that teachers at private schools had a significantly more positive attitude toward children with ADHD, but this is not consistent with the results in the abstract.
The different parts of the attitude and knowledge questionnaire have not been discussed here. It is important to know how the teachers think about ADHD and its interventions.
The difference in outcomes at two time points (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention) has not been explained.

- Discussion: The aim of the study has not been correctly described, as I mentioned in the title comment.
What is a conventional training program?
The results of this study have not been compared with previous studies, and it is not clear what its advantages are.

- Limitations: Financial limitations cannot justify the lack of a control group.
- The article needs major English editing.
- This manuscript needs major revision.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 17 Jun 2020

The final changes that the author should make are as follows:
The title does not describe the aim of the study. It is better to write: The efficacy of a workshop educational program on Knowledge, Attitude, and Performance of Primary School Teachers toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

- In the abstract, the sample size is estimated to be 192 participants (32×6), while in the method section, the number of teachers who took part in the workshops is 144. Another issue is: how could they evaluate the performance of teachers in dealing with children with ADHD in such a short period of time?

- Introduction: The fifth paragraph is not clear in terms of English writing. In the last paragraph, the third line is not easily understood.

There are at least two other studies conducted in Tehran on this issue, and one of them is a clinical trial. It is important to mention them in this article: (Comparison of Effect of Workshop and Training Package Teaching Methods on Changing Primary School Teachers' Knowledge and Attitudes toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
Mojgan Khademi, Niloofar Safai, Simasadat Noorbakhsh, Rozita Davari Ashtiani, and Leili Panaghi.)

Investigating the knowledge and attitude of primary school teachers in Tehran towards Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity and Learning Disorders and their relation to teacher's characteristics (Nina Salamatbakhsh et al.)

- Method: The determination of the sample size is unclear.

- Results: They showed that teachers at private schools had significantly more positive attitudes toward children with ADHD, but this is not consistent with the results in the abstract.
The different parts of the attitude and knowledge questionnaire have not been discussed here. It is important to know how the teachers think about ADHD and its interventions.
The difference in outcomes between the two time points (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention) has not been explained.

- Discussion: The aim of the study has not been correctly described, as I mentioned in the comment on the title.
What is the conventional training program?
The results of this study have not been compared with previous studies, and it is not clear what its advantages are.

- Limitations: Financial limitations cannot justify the lack of a control group.
- The article needs major English language editing.
- The ethical code should be added by the authors.

It still needs minor revision.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 3 Jul 2020

Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your paper according to the reviewers' comments.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their replies to all comments, one by one.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation.
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Effectiveness of an educating program on Knowledge, Attitude, and Performance of Primary School Teachers toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

1- The title does not describe the aim of the study.

Response: The title has now been changed to “Effectiveness of a workshop educating program on Knowledge, Attitude, and Performance of Primary School Teachers toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder”

2- In the abstract, the sample size is estimated to be 192 participants (32×6), while in the method part, the number of teachers who took part in the workshops is 144?

Response: Corrected as advised.

3-how they could evaluate the function of teachers in facing children with ADHD in such a short period of time?

Response: Teachers’ function was evaluated by comparing their reports of control strategies before and after the workshop. As you advised there is a concern that the training period was not long enough for maintaining a sustainable function. We now have raised this concern in the limitation section.

4- Introduction: The fifth paragraph is not clear in terms of English writing.

Response: This paragraph has now been revised.

5-In the last paragraph, the third line is not easily understood.

Response: Corrected.

6-There are at least two other studies which are conducted in Tehran about this issue and one of them is a clinical trial and it is important to mention them in this article: Comparison of Effect of Workshop and Training Package Teaching Methods on Changing Primary School Teachers’ Knowledge and Attitudes toward Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Mojgan Khademi, Niloofar Safai, Simasadat Noorbakhsh, Rozita Davari Ashtiani, and Leili Panaghi. Investigating the knowledge and attitude of primary school teachers in Tehran towards Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity and Learning Disorders and their relation to teacher's characteristics (Nina Salamatbakhsh et al)

Response: Added as advised.

7- Method: Determining sample size is unclear.

Response: We now have extended information about the sampling in the method section.

8- Results: They showed that teachers at private schools had a significantly more positive attitudes toward children with ADHD, while it is not compatible with the results in the abstract part.

Response: We now have corrected the abstract.

9-The different part of the attitude and knowledge questionnaire has not been discussed here. It is important to know how the teachers think about ADHD and its interventions.

Response: We now have explained some items of knowledge and attitude in the result section.

10- Discussion: The aim of the study has not been correctly described as I mentioned in the title.

Response: Corrected as advised.

12- What is the conventional training program?

Response: We now have corrected this sentence and replaced it with more precise sentences.

12-The results of this study have not been compared with former studies.

Response: We now have extended the discussion and compared our results to those of previous studies (page 7).

13- It is not clear what the advantages of it are.

Response: We now have discussed the strengths of our study in page 8.

14-Limitations: Financial limitations cannot justify the lack of a control group.

Response: Corrected as suggested.

15- The article needs a major English edition.

Response: The manuscript now has been thoroughly proofread.

16- The ethical code should be added by the authors.

Response: We now have added the ethical code as advised.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 20 Mar 2021 – 20 Mar 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 20 Mar 2021

Please see my review in the attached file.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 20 Mar 2021

Unfortunately, you have not done all of the requested revisions, nor have you responded to all of the reviewers' comments. Please revise the manuscript according to those comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using the Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 20 Mar 2021

Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments, it needs some more revisions. Please make your revisions according to these comments. I would appreciate it if you could make the revisions as soon as possible using Track Changes mode in MS Word and colored text.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response letter

Thank you very much for taking the time to review our manuscript. Below, please find the changes made based on the reviewers' comments:

1- Abstract: What do you mean regarding "uneducated teachers"?
- We now have revised the abstract.

2- A list of three to five keywords should be included below the abstract in alphabetical order and should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine's Medical Subject Headings (MESH) browser list.
- Corrected as advised.

3- There is another study which is conducted in Tehran about this issue and is important to mention them in this article: Comparison of Effect of Workshop and Training Package …
- We now have added the recommended study in the introduction "In a comparative study on effectiveness of two methods in changing knowledge and attitudes of primary school teachers toward ADHD, the findings revealed that workshops were more effective than written training package (31)".

4- The difference in outcome has not been explained in two-point of time (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention)
- We now have extended the result and mentioned "Although a slight decline was observed from time two (immediately after intervention) to time three (two-week follow up) in the mean scores of knowledges (30.23 to 28.71), attitude (50.86 to 48.16) and function (32.50 to 31.40), these differences were not statistically significant (all $p>.05$), suggesting the lasting effectiveness of the intervention".

5- Terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within a paper should be abbreviated.
- Corrected

6- References have thoroughly been revised as advised.

7- Table 1 errors:
- Corrected.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 6 Apr 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Apr 2021

Thank you for making the corrections. One of the reviewers had mentioned "The difference in outcome has not been explained in two-point of time (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention)", and you have made the necessary corrections in the text of the article. But the corrections that need to be made in this regard in Table 3 have not yet been made.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response letter
16/05/2021

Dear Dr Zarghami,

Thank you very much for taking the time to review our manuscript. Below, please find the changes made based on the reviewers' comments:

1- Abstract: What do you mean regarding "uneducated teachers"?
- We now have revised the abstract.

2- A list of three to five keywords should be included below the abstract in alphabetical order and should be taken from those recommended by the US National Library of Medicine's Medical Subject Headings (MESH) browser list.
- Corrected as advised.

3- There is another study which is conducted in Tehran about this issue and is important to mention them in this article: Comparison of Effect of Workshop and Training Package …
- We now have added the recommended study in the introduction "In a comparative study on effectiveness of two methods in changing knowledge and attitudes of primary school teachers toward ADHD, the findings revealed that workshops were more effective than written training package (31)".

4- The difference in outcome has not been explained in two-point of time (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention)
- We now have extended the result and mentioned "Although a slight decline was observed from time two (immediately after intervention) to time three (two-week follow up) in the mean scores of knowledges (30.23 to 28.71), attitude (50.86 to 48.16) and function (32.50 to 31.40), these differences were not statistically significant (all p>.05), suggesting the lasting effectiveness of the intervention".

5- Terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within a paper should be abbreviated.
- Corrected

6- References have thoroughly been revised as advised.

7- Table 1 errors:
- Corrected.

8- The difference in outcome has not been explained in two-point of time in table 3 (immediately after and 2 weeks after the intervention)
- We now have added a new column for the Bonferroni post-hoc pairwise comparisons and included the relevant results.

9- To ensure that article referees or peer reviewers do not know your identity (as author[s] of the manuscript being reviewed), Reply to Reviewers should not contain author names or affiliations.
- To ensure Blindness of Peer Review, *Acknowledgement and funding* have been removed from the manuscript and added to the title page.

Sincerely

4 Revision 3

2 comments · 6 Jul 2021 – 6 Jul 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 6 Jul 2021

It is a pleasure to accept the manuscript in its current form for publication in IJPBS.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 6 Jul 2021

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation with the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.