

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_118263
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Parents in Educating Children with Intellectual Disabilities during COVID-19 in India
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. 2. Partially. Maybe Parents´ challenges instead of The Role of Parents... 3. Yes, it is. 4. No, they are not. They seem to be ore adequate for a report, not a scientific paper. Moreover, some ideas are repetitive. (For example: technology barriers). In the section, Balancing Work and Caregiving Responsibilities, the author can/should explore more the role of the mothers. 5. Maybe, the author could contextualize more the research. In “many parents reported positive outcomes and developmental gains in their children”, whose parents, where, and how were they interviewed? The same applies to the case studies. 6. Yes, there are. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Some language revision is needed. For example: hese</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The organization of the text is not particularly adequate. The outcome preceded the case studies.</p> <p>In “Policy Implications and Recommendations”, the author again repeats what he/she has already mentioned.</p> <p>The readers have to believe in the author´s data, as there are no participants´ voices/citations/positions. There is also a lack of context in which this research has taken place since India is a large country. Thus, it seems a universal view, disregarding the exceptions, which leaves many questions concerning methodology unanswered.</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:	Nara Hiroko Takaki
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil