



Comparative Effectiveness of Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) and Neurofeedback on Executive Functions in Female Senior High School Students with Internalizing and Externalizing Behavioral Disorders in Tehran

Seyedeh Golzar Razavi¹, Ali Zadehmohammadi^{2*}, Mohammadreza Bigdeli³, Hossien Bigdeli⁴

¹ Department of Psychology, SR. C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Family Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

³ Department of Animal Sciences and Marine Biology, Faculty of Life Sciences and Biotechnology, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

⁴ Department of Psychology, ET. C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran

* Corresponding author email address: dr_zadeh@sbu.ac.ir

E d i t o r

Nadereh Saadati
nsaadati@kmanresce.ca
KMAN Research Institute:
Richmond Hill, CA

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Amir Hossein Mehrsafari
Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran.
Email: a.mehrsafari@semnan.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Amir Dana
Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran.
Email: amirdana2010@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Comment: 1. The conceptual rationale for comparing EMDR and neurofeedback is not sufficiently developed.

Response: We appreciate this insightful comment. We have strengthened the theoretical framework and explicitly clarified the rationale for comparing EMDR and neurofeedback by emphasizing their distinct yet complementary mechanisms (emotional processing vs. neuroregulation).

Comment: 2. Clarification is needed regarding BRIEF scoring interpretation.

Response: Thank you for highlighting this important point. The scoring procedure has been clarified in the Methods section. We confirm that scores were interpreted based on the adapted scoring approach and have explicitly explained this to avoid confusion.

Comment: 3. Methodological transparency (randomization, blinding) is insufficient.

Response: We have revised the Methods section to provide a clearer description of the randomization process. Although full blinding was not feasible due to the nature of the interventions, this limitation has now been acknowledged.

Comment: 4. Discussion overinterprets neurobiological mechanisms.

Response: We agree and have revised the Discussion to present neurobiological interpretations more cautiously, framing them as theoretical explanations supported by prior literature.

Comment: 5. Inconsistency in conclusions regarding intervention superiority.

Response: We have carefully revised the Discussion and Conclusion sections to ensure full consistency with the statistical findings, clearly stating that no significant difference was observed between the two interventions.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Comment: 1. Limited generalizability due to female-only sample.

Response: We acknowledge this limitation and have expanded the discussion regarding gender-specific considerations and generalizability.

Comment: 2. Lack of detail regarding intervention fidelity.

Response: We have added details about intervention delivery, including session structure and supervision, to improve transparency.

Comment: 3. Weak control group design (waitlist).

Response: We agree that the waitlist control is a limitation and have explicitly discussed this issue in the revised manuscript.

Comment: 4. Short follow-up period.

Response: We have revised the interpretation of follow-up findings to reflect short-term maintenance rather than long-term stability.

Comment: 5. Reference list requires refinement.

Response: We have carefully reviewed and standardized all references, ensuring accuracy, consistency, and accessibility.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.