

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_95632
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Educational Considerations in Special Secondary Education in Greece (2015 – 2019)
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. We can see the abstract: The aim is to highlight either the different policies for Special Education compared to previous periods, or the evolution of previous policies. As can be seen from our study, the period 2015 – 2019 is considered to be decisive in the evolution of policies for Special Secondary Education.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article suitable</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the beginning of the sentence, the researcher discusses the study of vocational secondary education policy, but in the objective, the researcher talks about special education policy expertise and compares it with education in the previous period, please describe more of these objectives, more specifically what parts will be highlighted and further clarify the methods used. 2. Add 1 sentence more about methodology 3. What are the research findings in this abstract?? 4. Please highlight the practical contributions of the research in this paper Highlights 5. In the abstract, make clear for standard publication for journal. Purpose (1 sentence), method(1-2 sentences), results (2 sentences) and discussion (1 sentence). <p>Subsections and the structure of the manuscript are not appropriate, it needs to be improved using standards and the structure of journal articles. The structure of the manuscript in the journal must contain IMRAD. IMRAD stands for Introduction, Method, Results and Discussion.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Authors need to check cited references and add a few recent articles. There is no need for footnotes, journals or books used as cited material can be stored in the references section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In order to improve the readability, the authors are suggested to have this manuscript read by a person with sufficient English proficiency and technical background. It could eliminate some slight grammatical errors</p> <p>Please see the comments.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Over all the theme of the paper is good, but more literature review and reference is needed by author.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muktiarni
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia