

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2192
Title of the Manuscript:	Physiological and Psychological Mechanisms of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder
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 briefly summarizes the physiological mechanisms related to ADHD. Being that brief and compact is one of the strength of this manuscript.However, some crucial components and connections seem missing in the text. Below, I have covered them all.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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 includes a section on the 'method,' but this section is missing from the manuscript where it should be included. We need to see the selection process and criteria of the articles used for this manuscript. If the manuscript is called as review, the author sould follow PRISMA, boosting its scientific basis. If PRISMA has already ignored, then the author should reveal its selection criteria (research articles or metaanalysis –e.g. from last 5 years- etc)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The flow of the manuscript seem so convenient and harmonious in general. As I said above, method part is missing. There also some issues about subsections. In the section of abnormal brain regions and networks there are some important research results. But there is a lack of a connection between differences in brain networks and regions of children and their ADHD symptoms. Those results are related to or lead what? Cognitive impairment? Delayed response? I can see that psychological symptoms are explained at the last part of the manuscript. However, the link between physiological differences in brain and psychological symptoms is still missing in the manuscript. I'm not sure, but when I consider the title of the book and the last sentence of this manuscript I think there should be a separate section about technology and ADHD. There is a disparity between the text and the conclusion. In the conclusion, we cannot give a new information that we did not previously disclosed. So, the author should tell something about those limitations beforehand. For example, there are inconsistent results about the role of brain regions and networks in ADHD. Researcher speculated that those inconsistencies are due to the differences in research method, design and measurement tools used. If you provide those informations above, the conclusion would be satisfactory. Similarly, word of “technology” comes at the last sentence of the manuscript. Which technologies? No technology is mentioned beforehand. Do you mean the technologies for research or treatment, or effect of technologies on ADHD? Maybe there should be couple of paragraph on technology and ADHD.	

Review Form2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	First paragraph under “Introduction”: The rate of the cases whose symptoms persist into adulthood much more than 3% in the literature (e.g. Biederman, J., Faraone, S. V., Mick, E., Spencer, T., Wilens, T., Kiely, ... Warburton, R. (1995). High risk for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder among children of parents with childhood onset of the disorder: A pilot study. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 152(3), 431–435. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.152.3.431 Kessler, R. C., Adler, L., Barkley, R., Biederman, J., Conners, C. K., Demler, O., ... Spencer, T. (2006). The prevalence and correlates of adult ADHD in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. American Journal of Ppsychiatry, 163(4), 716-723). Please check the information again. The literature review seems to provide concise relations between genes, biochemical or brain regions/network and ADHD. However, the author wrote in the abstract that there is still no consensus on many issues. Indeed, there is no consensus and even inconsistent results about many of those variabilities and ADHD (e.g. working memory performance, default mode network, dopamine system). The tone of the manuscript should be maybe more indefinite, leaving room for inconsistencies and lack of causal links.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They seem sufficient to me.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language seems suitable. However, we don't usually use the word “disease” for ADHD which is defined as “disorder”. Also, we don't want to contribute to the stigmatization of the people with ADHD that's why when we write or talk about ADHD we try to mention both pros and cons of the ADHD. There are pros like creativity, overattention, or being energetic. I encourage the author to comprise those aspects of ADHD in the manuscript. In the section of “Genetic factors”, first sentence is like “From the perspective of genetic genetics,...”. It seems the word mistakenly duplicated.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vahide Ulusoy Gokcek
Department, University & Country	Turkiye