PUBLISHING INSTITUTE
Journal Website
Article history:
Received 08 December 2024
Revised 02 February 2025
Accepted 10 February 2025
Published online 01 March 2025

Psychological Research in Individuals with Exceptional Needs

OPEN PEER-REVIEW REPORT

E-ISSN: 3060-6713

The Effectiveness of Mindfulness on Selective Attention, Visuospatial Memory, and Academic Performance in Elementary School Students with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Fahimeh. Fazlollah Hamedani[1*], Malihe. Masalehgo[1]

[1] Department of Psychology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: fahimehamedanii@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In Methods, Study Design paragraph, the authors state: “A sample of 30 students diagnosed with ADHD was selected…” but no demographic details (gender, age distribution, ADHD subtype) are provided. This omission limits the interpretability of the findings.

The Inclusion Criteria section states: “diagnosis of ADHD by a specialist based on DSM-5 criteria.”

Please clarify whether standardized clinical interviews, rating scales, or medical records were used to confirm diagnosis.

The manuscript notes: “randomly assigned to an experimental group (n = 15) and a control group (n = 15).”

Details about what these activities entailed are essential to assess whether the control condition adequately controls for nonspecific effects (e.g., time, attention, group interaction).

Tables 2 and 3 present F values, p-values, and effect sizes, but do not include confidence intervals for adjusted means or mean differences. Including them would strengthen statistical interpretation.

In Discussion, paragraph 1, the statement “mindfulness exerted a robust and meaningful influence on both cognitive and academic domains” is strong; however, it does not sufficiently acknowledge the small sample size or contextual limitations that may restrict generalizability.

In Discussion, paragraph 2, the authors attribute selective attention improvements to theorized cognitive mechanisms without presenting direct evidence from the study (e.g., no mediational analysis). This should be framed more cautiously.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The randomization procedure (e.g., lottery, random number generator) should be explicitly described to strengthen methodological rigor.

In the Measures section, the description of the Stroop Test explains components but not which scoring metric (e.g., interference score, time score, errors) was used as the dependent variable. This is essential for reproducibility.

In several parts of the Measures section, the authors use general phrases such as “adequate reliability” and “satisfactory validity.”

Exact reliability coefficients and validation results for the instruments used in this specific sample should be stated.

The Measures section states that the “longest correctly reproduced sequence” was used.

Please clarify whether forward span, backward span, or both were included, as these represent different cognitive constructs.

In the description of the Academic Performance Questionnaire, the authors write: “This questionnaire typically consists of 20 to 30 items…”

The exact version used, number of items, subscales, and scoring range should be specified.

The Intervention section lists multiple mindfulness components but lacks session-by-session objectives and standardized scripts. Providing a structured outline would increase replicability.

The manuscript states that the control group “continued with routine school activities.”

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.

E-ISSN: 3060-6713