

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_128176
Title of the Manuscript:	Pebble Walk for Gifted Learners: Revealing Needs, Challenges, and Interventions through a Systematic Literature Review.
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper discusses a highly relevant, possibly less approached topic in today's literature: gifted learners, and how their needs are addressed. In the context of today's literature and research which seems more focused on integrating students with special educational needs that fall into the learning difficulties and disabilities category, this systematic literature review is timely and useful to all teachers and education policy makers. The author(s) discuss gifted learners' socio-emotional skills and explore teaching interventions to support their well-being, and foster their development in accordance with their particularities and needs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The phrase "Pebble walk" used in the title is too metaphorical, although appropriate and beautiful; however, it may be misleading as it may lend a stance of poetic feeling, which is not always suitable to a scientific article. We believe that the title should rely on the key concepts of the paper. Therefore, we kindly recommend that the author(s) remove the "pebble walk" expression from the title, and rephrase the title to make it sound more appealing and scientific. For example, the title could be: Opportunities and Challenges of Working with Gifted Learners. A Systematic Literature Review.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. The arguments provided rely on thorough, recent literature. The Interventions and frameworks for gifted learners section may benefit from adding suggestions on teaching approaches that match the age and more specific particularities of gifted learners. As it is, this section appears quite generalist. Also, the use of AI or computer-based enriched programs are mentioned, with no further details about what exactly these mean, or how these may be used in classes with gifted learners. The Discussion section may also benefit from adding whether education policy-makers, and school management staff should do more about supporting teachers to work with gifted students.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript would benefit from minor English language editing. For example, in the Methods sections, the sentence may seem illogical: "This paper is analyzed using the systematic literature review". Also, there are other minor errors, which may be typos.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Boghian Ioana
Department, University & Country	Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău, Romania