

Paper: “Effect of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy on Pupils with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in Two Selected Primary Schools in Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana”

Submitted: 17 July 2021

Accepted: 03 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Felix Senyamator

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p146

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nirmaljit K. Rathee
Delaware State University, USA

Reviewer 2: Stephen Doh Fia
University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Reviewer 3: Grazia Angeloni
University “G. d’Annunzio”, Italy

Reviewer 4: Abdelali Kaaouachi
Mohammed I University, Morocco

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Nirmaljit Rathee	
University/Country: United States of America	
Date Manuscript Received: Aug. 11, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: Aug. 15, 2021
Manuscript Title: Effect of cognitive behavioural therapy on pupils with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in two selected primary schools in Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0772/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>Title is very clear and concise</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Abstract properly represents the gist of the paper and contains the required information.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Although there are no major grammatical errors or spelling mistakes, but paper uses different fonts and font size. line spacing is also not consistent. Please get these matter corrected.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Methodology is very explanatory.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Results have been clearly stated</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusions have been drawn properly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are clear and comprehensive.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	Yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 11/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/08/2021
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOURAL THERAPY ON PUPILS WITH ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER IN TWO SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN CAPE COAST METROPOLIS, GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 72.07.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>About three-fourth of the references were not appropriately written according to the APA style required by the journal. Spacing requirements of the journal were not adequately met. Two of the references were repeated.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	√
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think this paper is a good contribution to literature. However, the manuscript needs some extra work and this has been indicated by use of track changes in the document. The research design chosen should be justified. Also, the target population and accessible population should be clarified. Authors should state clearly who participants are because Parents and Teachers who were participants at a point became independent assessors. Authors need to relook at references and write them out according to the APA style.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Grazia Angeloni	
University/Country: University "G. d'Annunzio" Chieti- Pescara (Italy)	
Date Manuscript Received: August 20 th , 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: August 23 rd , 2021
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOURAL THERAPY ON PUPILS WITH ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER IN TWO SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN CAPE COAST METROPOLIS, GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 72.07.21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

The title is fit for the further paragraphs(<i>Please insert your comments</i>)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is complete and fulfill the reason why this investigation	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The language is clear	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is well supported either by theories or qualitative-quantitative methods	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear and coherent with the research even if a follow up is suggested, especially with the group of parents taken into account	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are well organized	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references and the foreign literature has been quoted appropriately	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Since in paragraph 4.4 *Limitation of the Study* it is said: “This study could not establish whether or not parents of participants who were told to seek pharmacological interventions for their wards actually did so”, it should be feasible and interesting to effect a follow up, not because of a generalization, but in order to give the conclusion of such investigation more accuracy.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

none

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Abdelali Kaaouachi	
University/Country: University Mohammed I, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/08/2021
Manuscript Title: EFFECT OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIOURAL THERAPY ON PUPILS WITH ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER IN TWO SELECTED PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN CAPE COAST METROPOLIS, GHANA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 72.07.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

The title is clear and very informative. It provides information on the effect of one variable (CBT) on another variable (ADHD) in the context of two primary schools in Ghana.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is well done given that it presents the object of the research, the methodology and some main results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Some grammatical and typographical errors, not severe, were detected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology is well described.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion is quite general. It is not specific to the study. No reminder was formulated on the objectives of the research and the results found, by discussing them. Elements of perspectives, resulting from the search results, are omitted. Citation of recommendations is appreciated.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references list is comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Revise the text and correct some spelling and typographical errors.
Formulate a conclusion that recalls the content of the article, while offering recommendations and perspectives in light of the research results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: