









Comparing the Effectiveness of a Parenting Package Based on Responsiveness to Mothers' Parenting Needs with Organizational Skills Training on Academic Emotion, Task Avoidance Behavior, and Organizational Skills in Children Aged 8-12 with Sluggish Cognitive Tempo

Nasim. Arjhang^{1*}, Mansoureh. Bahramipourisfahani², Zahra. Yousefi²

¹ PhD Student, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Korasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Korasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: bahramipourisfahani@khuif.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Ahmad Abedi  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology of Children with Special Needs, University of Isfahan, Iran a.abedi@edu.ui.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Seyed Milad Saadati  Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology (LMP), University of Toronto, Canada. Email: m.saadati@mail.utoronto.ca

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Date: 28 August 2023

Reviewer:

The article is generally well-structured, with a clear introduction, methodology, results, and discussion sections. However, the transition between sections could be made smoother by providing brief summaries or conclusions at the end of each section to guide the reader through the paper's progression.

The review of related literature establishes a solid foundation for the study. To strengthen this further, consider incorporating more recent studies that specifically address the effectiveness of parenting interventions in children with SCT, as this would contextualize your findings within the current research landscape.

The methodology is well-described, but additional details on the intervention content could enhance the replicability of the study. For instance, providing a more detailed session-by-session breakdown of the parenting programs would be beneficial.

The statistical analysis is thorough, but the discussion on the assumptions of the repeated measures ANOVA and the rationale behind choosing this test could be expanded. Clarifying this choice would help in understanding the analysis's robustness.

The discussion section thoughtfully considers the implications of the findings and suggests practical applications. To improve, explicitly address the study's limitations regarding sample size and demographic diversity. Acknowledging these limitations and suggesting directions for future research would provide a more balanced view.

The inclusion of tables summarizing the findings is helpful. Consider adding figures or charts to visually represent the changes in academic emotion, task avoidance behavior, and organizational skills across the three groups over time, enhancing the reader's ability to quickly grasp the study's outcomes.

Ensure that all references are up-to-date and relevant. Adding references to similar studies conducted in different cultural contexts could offer a broader perspective on the applicability of the findings.

Minor typographical and grammatical errors should be corrected to enhance the paper's professionalism. A thorough proofreading pass is recommended.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 30 August 2023

Reviewer:

The research question is innovative, targeting a specific population (children with SCT) and comparing two distinct intervention types. However, the rationale behind selecting these particular interventions for comparison could be elaborated upon further. Expanding on this choice would solidify the study's foundation.

The study includes a control group that received no intervention. For future iterations, considering an active control group that receives a non-specific form of support or education might offer a stronger contrast and add depth to the understanding of the specific interventions' effectiveness.

The description of the interventions and participant selection is clear but lacks depth in certain areas. For instance, detailing the criteria for SCT diagnosis and the process for ensuring fidelity in the delivery of the interventions would strengthen the methodology section.

While the use of repeated measures ANOVA is appropriate, a more comprehensive statistical analysis could provide deeper insights. Including effect size calculations for each main effect and interaction would offer a clearer understanding of the interventions' practical significance. Additionally, exploring the potential mediators and moderators (e.g., age, gender, baseline symptom severity) could uncover more nuanced findings.

The literature review is adequate but could be enhanced by a broader scope, including studies on parenting interventions for related conditions (e.g., ADHD) to position the study within a wider theoretical and empirical context. This would also help to highlight the study's unique contributions more effectively.

The discussion section would benefit from a more thorough examination of alternative explanations for the findings. For example, discussing how the parents' engagement level or the children's initial symptom severity might have influenced the outcomes would provide a more nuanced interpretation of the results.

The study's design is robust, yet incorporating a longer-term follow-up assessment could significantly enhance the understanding of the interventions' durability. Discussing the feasibility and importance of such follow-ups would be a valuable addition to the paper.

Integrating qualitative feedback from participants about their experience with the interventions could add depth to the findings. This could help in understanding the mechanisms behind the interventions' effects and in identifying areas for further refinement.

Given the significance of the findings, a more thorough revision is recommended to address these points, potentially leading to a more impactful and robust contribution to the field.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.