

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101394
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Influence of Parental Literacy Status on the Implementation of Dance Movement Therapy for Motor Skill Development in Children with Intellectual Disability in India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	The topic matter is unique and clear. There is much to be gained and studied further due to the contributions from both a parent literacy aspect, as well as a motor skill development lens. The information is presented in a written and chart form, adding to the effectiveness of the overall presentation. Article title is suitable. The abstract needs to be shortened. It has far too many words at this time. The author might want to add more about limitations. How were parents chosen as educated or not educated. List criteria more clearly. This appears to be on sound scientific ground. References seem to be appropriate.	No
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper must be reread and edited completely. There are many typos. There are also phrases that do not sound like proper usage of the English language.	
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) No	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chris Sclafani
Department, University & Country	Queens College, USA