

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_122065</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Investigation of The Relationship Between Mindfulness and Post-Earthquake Trauma Levels of Sports Sciences Faculty Students Who Take and Don't Take Folk Dance Lesson</b>
Type of the Article	

**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>
<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>	This manuscript for the academic and social and an importance for the humanity is nice.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<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>	Suggestion: Introduction; Objective, Methods Results Discussion and conclusion.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>The subsections:</b> Introduction; Objective, Methods Results Discussion and conclusion	
<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>	This manuscript is not scientifically robust because there many questions about the weak and inappropriate DATA ANALYSIS both to qualitative and quantitative approach the authors MUST done adequate data analysis. For qualitative approach " recorded interviewers" only is insufficient. I know the "this journal not refuses the manuscript" but some times is necessary "refuses bad manuscripts with data analysis weak or with mistakes.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	May be.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes .	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jonas Daniel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Federal of Bahia, Brazil</b>