

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research - New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2190
Title of the Manuscript:	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: One of the Risk Factors for Campus Bullying in Elementary and Middle School
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses the significant issue of the relationship between Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and campus bullying, particularly in elementary and middle schools. The research highlights the prevalence of both ADHD and bullying, their interconnectedness, and the need for multi-level interventions. I appreciate this manuscript because it tackles an underexplored area with profound implications for the mental health and development of affected children. The comprehensive literature review and proposed interventions from family, school, and societal levels are particularly valuable. However, the manuscript could benefit from more localized studies and longitudinal research to generalize the findings and verify the proposed intervention strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: One of the Risk Factors for Campus Bullying in Elementary and Middle School," is appropriate as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the article. It clearly communicates the primary subjects of ADHD and bullying within the specified educational context. Therefore, I believe the title is suitable and effectively summarizes the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study. To improve it, I recommend adding specific data points about ADHD prevalence and bullying rates for clarity. Additionally, including a brief mention of the intervention strategies discussed in the paper would provide a fuller picture. This would enhance the abstract's utility for readers seeking a quick yet thorough understanding of the research. On the other hand, the abstract is well-written, but these enhancements could increase its impact and informativeness. No deletions are necessary, as all content is relevant.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with appropriate subsections, making it easy to navigate and understand. The division into sections such as introduction, research progress, and intervention strategies is logical and effectively guides the reader through the content. To further improve the structure, consider adding a separate section for limitations and future research directions. This addition would offer a more complete perspective on the study and suggest areas for future exploration. Overall, the current structure is effective and facilitates a clear presentation of the research findings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and technical soundness through its extensive review of relevant literature spanning two decades. The research methodology is meticulously outlined, lending credibility to the findings. The use of specific statistical data to highlight the relationship between ADHD and bullying strengthens the manuscript's conclusions. Furthermore, the intervention strategies are well-supported by existing evidence, ensuring their feasibility and effectiveness. The manuscript's comprehensive approach and solid evidence base make it a valuable contribution to the field.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript's references are comprehensive and up-to-date, effectively covering a wide range of relevant research. Drawing from 54 papers over the past 20 years provides a solid foundation for the study. To further strengthen the research, including additional recent publications from the last couple of years could be beneficial. This would ensure the manuscript reflects the most current developments and perspectives. Incorporating recent large-scale studies or meta-analyses on ADHD and bullying might also enhance the robustness of the reference list. Overall, the references adequately support the manuscript's findings.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The languagequality of the article is well-suited for academic communication. The writing is clear and articulate, effectively conveying complex ideas without ambiguity. The terminology is used correctly, and the sentences are well-constructed, ensuring smooth readability. There are no major grammatical errors or confusing phrases that detract from the content. The manuscript's language is polished and meets the high standards required for scholarly work.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is well-researched and provides valuable insights into the relationship between ADHD and bullying. To further enrich the content, including a discussion on potential policy implications and recommendations for school administrators could be beneficial. Additionally, integrating more recent studies and expanding the discussion on the long-term effects of ADHD-related bullying would provide a deeper understanding of the topic. Including perspectives from educators or mental health professionals through interviews or surveys might also add practical dimensions to the study.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i></u> The manuscript appears to adhere to ethical standards, as it primarily involves a literature review and analysis of existing studies. There are no indications of ethical issues related to data collection or participant consent. However, it is essential to ensure that all referenced studies were conducted ethically, with proper consent and approval. Additionally, if any original data or case studies are included, it is crucial to verify that they have been handled in accordance with ethical guidelines. The manuscript seems to be ethically sound.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	There are no apparent competing interest issues in this manuscript.Maintaining transparency and impartiality is crucial in academic research, and this manuscript seems to uphold these standards. Should there be any affiliations or financial interests that might be seen as conflicts, they should be explicitly disclosed. The manuscript seems to be free from any competing interest concerns.	
If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	There are no indications of plagiarism in this manuscript based on the provided text. The content appears original, well-researched, and properly cited. However, to thoroughly ensure the originality of the manuscript, it would be advisable to run the text through a plagiarism detection tool. If any parts of the manuscript closely resemble previously published works, those instances should be highlighted and the relevant sources should be cited appropriately. As it stands, there is no evidence to suggest plagiarism.	

[Review Form2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petro Petlovanyi
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia