

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

<https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html>



Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies

Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: In Press(In Press) ; e151447

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Digital-Based Cognitive Rehabilitation on Executive Functions in Children with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder"

Author(s): Milad Haidarian, Masoume Pourmohamadreza-Tajrishi, Vahid Nejati, Mohsen Vahedi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Jul 2024
Revised Date:	2 Oct 2024
Accepted Date:	30 Sep 2024

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE : Reviewer

9 Aug 2024

Dear AE

my comments:

Thank you for your good research and topic. If you deem it appropriate, please consider the following suggestions:

1. Based on the statistics you reported, explain why ADHD is more prevalent in women than men.
2. What is the ratio in Iran?
3. Please correct the referencing style in lines 66 and 67.

4. In the introduction, state how your study differs from the previous study by Nejati et al. titled "The Effect of Cognitive Rehabilitation on the Improvement of Language Skills in 9-12 Years Old Children with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder."
5. What is the necessity of conducting your study?
6. What is the application of your study, and what risks do these children face if this intervention is not carried out?
7. Please explain the sampling method in detail.
8. Why were only boys invited to this study?
9. How long did the sample collection take?
10. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study?
11. Explain the protocol with references. Describe what programs it included and how each stage evaluated cognitive skills.
12. If the goal is to assess the effectiveness of the study protocol on cognitive skills, why was the Karner questionnaire used? As you mentioned in the tools section, this questionnaire is a type of screening tool and is less effective for measuring efficacy, in addition to diagnosing ADHD is one of your inclusion criteria.
13. Note the validity and reliability of your study's tools and previous Iranian studies.
14. What is your reasoning regarding the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the study protocol compared to previous studies? How do you justify the results?
15. Name at least three foreign studies that have used your protocol.
16. What is your justification for the ineffectiveness of the intervention on children's behavioral regulation?
17. Which of your tools measure meta-cognition and which measure executive functions? It would be better to align the information in the table with your tools

Samaneh Karamali Esmaili : Reviewer

20 Aug 2024

Dear Associate Editor

Congratulations to the authors of this article for this valuable work. I hope the comments will help to improve the article and its acceptance.

In the following, the comments are given separately for each section (there is no uploaded file).

Abstract:

Line 6: use a same term throughout the text: executive functions

In the method, the final sample size should only be written because the reader thinks that the Connors' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) and the Raven Progressive Matrices (RPM) are outcome measures, while they are inclusion criteria.

Line 12: specific score criteria or inclusion criteria?

Editing the text is required. For example line 16 is better to write:

Parents completed the BRIEF after the intervention and five weeks later. The data was analyzed using SPSS-25 software.

Result: Writing effect size is more informative than the percent of the variations. The percent of the variation is not conventionally reported for significance.

Keyword: Please match with the Mesh terms.

Introduction:

Line 31: Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder

Line 41 is not relevance to the topic of the paragraph.

Edit references in lines 66 and 67.

Delete "j" in line 73.

There is no literature review about the other computer-based cognitive rehabilitation except of the ARAM and investigating the advantages of ARAM in comparison with them.

The gap is addressed in lines 74 & 75 as "but fewer have directly addressed the core indicators of executive functions such as behavioral regulation and metacognition in children with ADHD." But there is not an obvious description or importance for behavioral regulation and metacognition and superiority of them on the componential skills of executive functioning.

There is no literature review about the effective technologies that are effective on neurodevelopmental disorders. For example, you can refer to these studies:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0891422222002487>

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35173923>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1087054717730611>

Objectives:

Line 78: "Given the implications of deficits in those indicators" is not clear.

Methods:

The inclusion criteria should be mentioned clearly. Please write inclusion & exclusion criteria separately.

Line 103: the absence of another neurodevelopmental disorders. (because ADHD is one of them)

Given that the criteria for diagnosis of ADHD is ruling out the other neurodevelopmental disorders including intellectual disability, What reason is there for using "the Raven Progressive Matrices (RPM)"?

The reason for using Conner's Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) should be addressed obviously.

In the abstract was mentioned: "the control group followed the standard school program" but in the method is written: "the control group utilized a generic computer game during their sessions"!

How was sampling in Sanandaj (line 86) but intervention in Tehran (Shahid Beheshti University; line 115)?!

There is no report for the inconsistency and negativity indices of the BRIEF.

There is not "data analysis" information at the end of the method section.

Results:

The data in Table 2 is not necessary especially the "school grade" is a function of "age". According to lines 187-190, Table 2 is not interesting for reader.

I suggest using "Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI)", "Metacognition Index (MI)", especially "Global Executive Composite (GEC)" as your variables throughout the text

and tables. Prevent different terms such as “overall executive function scores”, “Executive Functions”,....

Discussion:

Please use the full name of “attention deficit hyperactivity disorder” only for the first time throughout the text and use acronym of ADHD for the other times. Please follow this rule for all the acronyms throughout the text.

Line 240 & 256: when you write “research studies”, so you have to refer to more than one study.

Reference #13 is not an original research (is a book). But you names it as a study in several times (lines 240, 257, & ...)

Lines 240-253: “Formation of new neural structures” is not your outcome, so you cannot discuss this issue as finding of the present study. You can only state a small point that maybe

Line 256: reference 17 is not a study. It is about Raven test and is used inappropriately.

Lines 263-265: you are nor presented enough reason for this claim. The BRIEF has sufficiently researched and its behavior regulation index is validated.

Line 265: parental behavioral rating scales = a parent-report behavioral rating scale (throughout the text)

Lines 266-268: your dependent variables are behavioral regulation and metacognition. Does the CANTAB assess these variables?

Use a common term for "computer-based cognitive rehabilitation program" and "digital-based cognitive rehabilitation" throughout the text. Consider which word is more common.

Line 268: the reference list is up to #21; but the references in the text is over!

Lines 269-276: need to be clearer. There is not a correct reference (#17 in manual of the Raven test). Line 130 is written that one of the ARAM tasks work on inhibition. It is needed a reference for effect of motivation on regulating and inhibiting responses.

Line 279: “... several studies”, but only one reference.

About “the reliance on parental completion of questionnaires for executive function information” in line 296: is not your limitation. The BRIEF assesses the behavioral emergence of executive functioning that should be assessed with observing child’s behavior in the real life situations. The only people who have these information are the parents. The functional tests cannot assess the behavioral aspects of executive functioning.

Conclusion

You cannot use “executive functions” and “metacognition” as two separate variables. The “metacognition index” is an aspect of the total score of executive functions (Global Executive Composite) in the BRIEF. You can express, for example, the ARAM improve executive functions especially metacognitive skills.

References:

The references have not adaptation with the content that are referred in the text. For

example reference #19 is about the BRIEF, but is used for Conner's test in the text. It seems necessary to revise all the references.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

20 Aug 2024

Dear EIC

my comments to the authors:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled "The Effect of Digital-Based Cognitive Rehabilitation on Executive Functions in Children with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder" to the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies. After a thorough review process, we have received detailed comments from the reviewers, which are attached to this email. Based on their evaluations and my own assessment of your work, we have reached a decision.

While the reviewers acknowledged the potential significance of your research, they have identified several areas that require substantial revisions before the manuscript can be considered for publication. Therefore, we are recommending a Major Revision.

We kindly request that you address each of the reviewers' comments in detail in your revised manuscript. In addition, please provide a point-by-point response to each comment, explaining the changes made or justifying why certain suggestions may not have been incorporated.

Fatemeh Ehsani : EIC

21 Aug 2024

Dear Authors

According to the reviewers and associate editor's comments, your article needs to be revised majorly. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files up two months.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Comments of the first reviewer and my reply to them. They were remarked in green in the text as follows:

1. In introduction: There is no literature review about the effective technologies that are effective on neurodevelopmental disorders. For example, you can refer to these studies:

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0891422222002487>

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35173923/>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1087054717730611> **edited and added as references # 11, 13, 18.**

2. Based on the statistics you reported, explain why ADHD is more prevalent in women than men. **mentioned and edited**

3. What is the ratio in Iran? **it was reported**

4. In the introduction, state how your study differs from the previous study by Nejati et al. titled "The Effect of Cognitive Rehabilitation on the Improvement of Language Skills in 9-12 Years Old Children with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder." **The study aimed to evaluate cognitive rehabilitation's effect through balance-cognitive training on executive functions and behavioral symptoms in children with ADHD, but in current study the aim was only investigate the effect of digital-based rehabilitation program that focused on attention and memory on executive functions of children with ADHD. The intervention program and the dependent variable (behavioral symptoms and executive functions) were differed in both mentioned studies.**

5. What is the application of your study, and what risks do these children face if this intervention is not carried out? **edited and mentioned.**

6. What is the necessity of conducting your study? **preventing academic failure**

7. Please explain the sampling method in detail. **explained in details considering inclusion and exclusion criteria.**

8. Why were only boys invited to this study? **because the prevalence of ADHD falls between 3% to 7%, with higher rates in males than females. This is noted in the introduction.**

9. How long did the sample collection take? **It took about 2 months in spring season and it mentioned in the text.**

10. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study? **it mentioned in the text.**

11. Explain the protocol with references. Describe what programs it included and how each stage evaluated cognitive skills. **it was mentioned with the reference.**

12. If the goal is to assess the effectiveness of the study protocol on cognitive skills, why was the Karner questionnaire used? As you mentioned in the tools section, this questionnaire is a type of screening tool and is less effective for measuring efficacy, in addition to diagnosing ADHD is one of your inclusion criteria. **In order to confirm the diagnosis of attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder by a psychiatrist, this tool has been used to be sure about the presence of attention deficit because an important part of the intervention protocol focuses on improving attention and memory, which are often the important components of executive functions and are impaired in children with ADHD.**

13. Note the validity and reliability of your study's tools and previous Iranian studies. **edited and mentioned.**

14. What is your reasoning regarding the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the study protocol compared to previous studies? How do you justify the results? **mentioned in the text.**

15. Name at least three foreign studies that have used your protocol. **There are no foreign studies that completely similar to the protocol which used in present study and this is the**

innovation in current research, but the mentioned references # 13, 14, 20 are almost similar.

16. What is your justification for the ineffectiveness of the intervention on children's behavioral regulation? **mentioned and edited**

17. Which of your tools measure meta-cognition and which measure executive functions? It would be better to align the information in the table with your tools? **The BRIEF measures global executive functions and two indices of it are metacognition and behavior regulation.**

Comments of the second reviewer and my reply to them. They were remarked in red in the text as follows:

1. Please use the full name of "attention deficit hyperactivity disorder" only for the first time throughout the text and use acronym of ADHD for the other times. Please follow this rule for all the acronyms throughout the text. **done throughout the text**
2. Line 6: use a same term throughout the text: executive functions **done**
3. Use a common term for "computer-based cognitive rehabilitation program" and "digital-based cognitive rehabilitation" throughout the text. Consider which word is more common. **edited throughout the text and changed for DBCR instead.**
4. Line 12: specific score criteria or inclusion criteria? **edited**
5. In the method, the final sample size should only be written because the reader thinks that the Connors' Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) and the Raven Progressive Matrices (RPM) are outcome measures, while they are inclusion criteria. **done**
6. Editing the text is required. For example line 16 is better to write: Parents completed the BRIEF after the intervention and five weeks later. The data was analyzed using SPSS-25 software. **edited: As far as, SPSS is the initial of Software Program for Social Science, no need to write software after SPSS.**
7. Result: Writing effect size is more informative than the percent of the variations. The percent of the variation is not conventionally reported for significance. **edited**
8. Keyword: Please match with the Mesh terms. **done with the mesh**
9. Line 31: Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder **the disorder is named Attention Deficit/ Hyperactivity Disorder and need not the word 'with'**
10. Line 41 is not relevance to the topic of the paragraph. **edited and omitted**
11. There is no literature review about the other computer-based cognitive rehabilitation except of the ARAM and investigating the advantages of ARAM in comparison with them. **the references numbered 12, 13, 14, and 15 are about the other computer-based cognitive rehabilitation except of the ARAM that were mentioned in the text.**
12. Reference #13 is not an original research (is a book). But you names it as a study in several times (lines 240, 257, & ...)
Reference NO. 13 is as follows and edited throughout the text: Kirk, H., et al., Impact of attention training on academic achievement, executive functioning and behaviour in children with developmental disabilities: A randomised controlled trial. American. Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities., 2017. 122(2): p. 97-117.
<https://doi.org/10.1352/1944-7558-122.2.97>

13. There is no literature review about the effective technologies that are effective on neurodevelopmental disorders. For example, you can refer to these studies:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0891422222002487>
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35173923/>
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1087054717730611>. **it was mentioned in the text.**
14. Edit references in lines 66 and 67. **edited**
15. Reference #13 is not an original research (is a book). But you names it as a study in several times (lines 240, 257, & ...)
Reference NO. 13 is as follows and edited throughout the text: Kirk, H., et al., Impact of attention training on academic achievement, executive functioning and behaviour in children with developmental disabilities: A randomised controlled trial. American. Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities,, 2017. 122(2): p. 97-117. https://doi.org/10.1352/1944-7558-122.2.97
16. Delete “j” in line 71. **done**
17. The gap is addressed in lines 74 & 75 as “but fewer have directly addressed the core indicators of executive functions such as behavioral regulation and metacognition in children with ADHD.” But there is not an obvious description or importance for behavioral regulation and metacognition and superiority of them on the componential skills of executive functioning. **described the importance of BRI and MI as the most components of executive functions.**
18. Line 78: “Given the implications of deficits in those indicators” is not clear. **edited and rewritten.**
19. There is not “data analysis” information at the end of the method section. **It was mentioned before the introducing the ARAM program.**
20. The inclusion criteria should be mentioned clearly. Please write inclusion & exclusion criteria separately. **done separately.**
21. Line 265: parental behavioral rating scales = a parent-report behavioral rating scale (throughout the text). **This is full name of the CPRS and cannot be written something else.**
22. The reason for using Conner's Parent Rating Scale (CPRS) should be addressed obviously. **Given the alignment between the psychiatrist's diagnosis and the parents' reports regarding the child's behavior, the parents' behavior rating scale was utilized in this study.**
23. Given that the criteria for diagnosis of ADHD is ruling out the other neurodevelopmental disorders including intellectual disability, What reason is there for using “the Raven Progressive Matrices (RPM)”? **Sometimes ADHD coexists and have comorbidity with intellectual disability. Absence of intellectual disability is not a diagnostic criteria for ADHD according to DSM-5-TR.**

24. Line 103: the absence of another neurodevelopmental disorders. (because ADHD is one of them) **It was mentioned in the inclusion and exclusion criteria in previous lines.**
25. Use a common term for "computer-based cognitive rehabilitation program" and "digital-based cognitive rehabilitation" throughout the text. Consider which word is more common. **edited throughout the text and changed for DBCR instead.**
26. In the abstract was mentioned: "the control group followed the standard school program" but in the method is written: "the control group utilized a generic computer game during their sessions"! **edited and rewritten in the abstract.**
27. How was sampling in Sanandaj (line 86) but intervention in Tehran (Shahid Beheshti University; line 115)?! **edited**
28. Line 130 is written that one of the ARAM tasks work on inhibition. It is needed a reference for effect of motivation on regulating and inhibiting responses. **edited**
29. Line 265: parental behavioral rating scales = a parent-report behavioral rating scale (throughout the text) **This is full name of the CPRS and cannot be written something else.**
30. Line 265: parental behavioral rating scales = a parent-report behavioral rating scale (throughout the text) **This is full name of the CPRS and cannot be written something else.**
31. There is no report for the inconsistency and negativity indices of the BRIEF. **edited.**
32. The data in Table 2 is not necessary especially the "school grade" is a function of "age". According to lines 187-190, Table 2 is not interesting for reader. **edited and omitted**
33. I suggest using "Behavioral Regulation Index (BRI)", "Metacognition Index (MI)", especially "Global Executive Composite (GEC)" as your variables throughout the text and tables. Prevent different terms such as "overall executive function scores", "Executive Functions",....**done throughout the text**
34. Lines 240-253: "Formation of new neural structures" is not your outcome, so you cannot discuss this issue as finding of the present study. You can only state a small point that maybe **edited and rewritten.**
35. Line 240 & 256: when you write "research studies", so you have to refer to more than one study. **edited**
36. Line 256: reference 17 is not a study. It is about Raven test and is used inappropriately. **Reference No. 17 changed to No. 20 and edited as follows: Martinelli, M.K., S.H. Mostofsky, and K.S. Rosch, *Investigating the impact of cognitive load and motivation on response control in relation to delay discounting in children with ADHD.* Journal of abnormal child psychology, 2017. 45(7): p. 1339-1353. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-016-0237-6>**
37. Line 240 & 256: when you write "research studies", so you have to refer to more than one study. **edited**

38. Lines 263-265: you are not presented enough reason for this claim. The BRIEF has sufficiently researched and its behavior regulation index is validated. **edited and added emotional aspects of behavior regulation**
39. Line 265: parental behavioral rating scales = a parent-report behavioral rating scale (throughout the text) **This is full name of the CPRS and cannot be written something else and edited throughout the text.**
40. Lines 266-268: your dependent variables are behavioral regulation and metacognition. Does the CANTAB assess these variables? **The Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery (CANTAB) is a computerized neuropsychological test with a game-like and non-verbal environment that assesses the different cognitive domains like memory, attention, executive functions, learning, and problem solving that are the components of metacognition index and behavior regulation index.**
41. Line 268: the reference list is up to #21; but the references in the text is over! **edited.**
42. Lines 269-276: need to be clearer. There is not a correct reference (#17 in manual of the Raven test). **edited**
43. Line 279: "... several studies", but only one reference. **edited**
44. About "the reliance on parental completion of questionnaires for executive function information" in line 296: is not your limitation. The BRIEF assesses the behavioral emergence of executive functioning that should be assessed with observing child's behavior in the real-life situations. The only people who have this information are the parents. The functional tests cannot assess the behavioral aspects of executive functioning. **laboratory paradigms are the other way to assess young children's behavioral regulation strategies across multiple emotional contexts. Researchers code the behavioral strategies that children use to independently regulate their arousal including self-soothing, help-seeking or orientation toward a caregiver, disengagement of attention, avoidance, approach, and venting. It is from these observed behaviors that the EERBQ behavioral subscales are modeled. The related references are as follows: Rothbart, Mary K., et al. "Advances in developmental psychology." (1981): 37-86. & DOI: [10.1002/cd.23219925503](https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219925503)**
45. You cannot use "executive functions" and "metacognition" as two separate variables. The "metacognition index" is an aspect of the total score of executive functions (Global Executive Composite) in the BRIEF. You can express, for example, the ARAM improve executive functions especially metacognitive skills. **edited**
46. References:
The references have not adaptation with the content that are referred in the text. For example, reference #19 is about the BRIEF, but is used for Conner's test in the text. It seems necessary to revise all the references. **edited**

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer

19 Sep 2024

It is acceptable

Samaneh Karamali Esmaili : Reviewer

23 Sep 2024

Dear Associate Editor

my comments to the authors:

Review 2:

Thank you for answering the comments carefully and correcting them. Some of the following need to be corrected. I choose "Accept" so as not to waste time on a further review. But I suggest you follow these edits. Most likely, the proofreader will also provide these comments:

- In the objective section of the abstract, write the names of the variables instead of the names of the BRIEF scales. Because here you have not mentioned the BRIEF as your instrument so that the reader knows that these names mean the same BRIEF scales.
- In the method section and before the results section, put a title "statistical analysis" and put all the sentences you scattered about statistical methods under this title.
- When you use abbreviations in tables, you must include the full name of the acronyms as footnote of the table.
- The BRIEF scales (GEC, BRI, & MI), like tool names, require "the".

REFEREE : Associate Editor

24 Sep 2024

Dear Chief Editor

Thanks for making the corrections. Considering that the manuscript is largely prepared for publication, there are small points based on the reviewers' comments that should be addressed.

Fatemeh Ehsani : EIC

24 Sep 2024

Dear Authors

According to the reviewers and associate editor's comments, your article needs to be revised minor. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files up to one month.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Comments of the second reviewer and my reply to them. They were remarked in red and underlined in the text as follows:

- In the objective section of the abstract, write the names of the variables instead of the names of the BRIEF scales. Because here you have not mentioned the BRIEF as your instrument so that the reader knows that these names mean the same BRIEF scales.

It was done and mentioned the names of variables as: executive functions, behavioral regulation, and metacognition.

- In the method section and before the results section, put a title "statistical analysis" and put all the sentences you scattered about statistical methods under this title.

It was done as follows: The collected data were subjected to analysis using descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, alongside inferential statistics comprising the chi-square test, Mann-Whitney U test, Shapiro-Wilk test, Mauchly's test of sphericity, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures.

- When you use abbreviations in tables, you must include the full name of the acronyms as footnote of the table.

It was done as footnote of the tables as follows: M: mean; SD: standard deviation; GEC: general executive composite; BRI: behavior regulation index; MI: metacognition index; df: degree of freedom; MS: mean of squares; η^2 : Eta quotient.

- The BRIEF scales (GEC, BRI, & MI), like tool names, require "the".

It was done and written "the" before scales and tool names.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Associate Editor

28 Sep 2024

The manuscript is suitable for publication.

Fatemeh Ehsani : EIC

30 Sep 2024

Dear Authors

We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS. We hope to receive the other qualified articles from your group.

Best Wishes