

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_102556
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Awareness Of Elementary School Teachers About Reading Disability (Dyslexia) In Kingdom of Saudi Arabia ,Medina 2018
Type of the 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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, specifically for countries that experiencing an academic and teaching system reform. Such surveys and their subsequent studies can prevent human and financial resources to be wasted.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. There are so many titles and subsections that are not usual for papers.</p> <p>Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>In despite of attractive and useful concept behind of the study and a very large sample size, the manuscript is not written through the format of a scientific article. Unfortunately, it is more look like a PROPOSAL with an added discussion section rather than an article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. Because the manuscript is full of very long sentences almost without punctuations and VERB sometimes. Hard to find coherency.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mostafa Daemi
Department, University & Country	University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran