

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_121712</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Need For Exercise Materials Based On Range Of Motion Training For Special Education Teachers In Special Schools</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The research topic is an important one in the context of special education. The need for specialized didactic materials is significant, especially in the context of multiple disabilities. The initiative of the authors is therefore one to be appreciated. Unfortunately, the way the research is presented does not respect all the scientific rigors of academic writing. Overall, the research is not presented correctly, although from some parts of the article we realize that it was done correctly. The information is not correctly framed, some information from the methodology being, for example, present in the introduction. The results part is missing, no relevant statistical data are presented to support the statements made. There is no research question or hypothesis, sample, instrument description.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article does not reflect the type of research used, the purpose and the target population. It is also quite convoluted and difficult to follow. I suggest the following title: The impact of an intervention program based on range of motion training for special education teachers.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract needs substantial improvements. To enter the type of study, sample, methods and instruments. To review some statements for example, 'The research consists of two main parts: conclusion and recommendation.'</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the research is not presented correctly, although from some parts of the article we realize that it was done correctly. The information is not correctly framed, some information from the methodology being, for example, present in the introduction. The results part is missing, no relevant statistical data are presented to support the statements made. There is no research question or hypothesis, sample, instrument description. There is no theoretical part, instead the method or intervention is presented. This should be moved to the methodology part.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abbreviation CSN for "Children with Special Needs" is not one of the most frequently used in specialized literature. In contrast, the terms "SEN" (Special Educational Needs) and "SEND" (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) are much more commonly encountered and recognized internationally, especially in the context of education and educational policies. I recommend using SEN or SEND instead of CSN. I recommend using a current terminology, where terms such as abnormalities are not used, but difficulties, barriers, etc. The research design is presented in the methods section, correctly as a quasi-experimental one. This type of design must be consistent throughout the entire article: title, introduction, methodology, results, discussions and conclusions. The results part must be rewritten entirely. The authors must demonstrate statistically or qualitatively how they measured the impact of the intervention. In the current form, the statements made are not substantiated by empirical evidence.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The bibliographic references are very few and are not written correctly. Please review.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The style and fluency in English are good, but the use of some specialized terms must be revised, as I specified previously.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article has good potential but unfortunately it is not written according to the rigors of academic writing. I recommend the authors to rewrite the entire article respecting all parts of a specialized article: introduction, theoretical background, research question, method (study type, sample, instruments, procedure, experiment description), results, discussions (with limitations), conclusion.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anca Luștrea</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>West University of Timisoara, Romania</b>