

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_83244
Title of the Manuscript:	DIFFICULTIES OF TACTILE SENSORY SYSTEM SENSORY INTEGRATION OF CHILDREN WITH DOWN SYNDROME
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The research addresses an interesting issue, but the results could be further exploited by formulating practical recommendations to help parents and teachers of children with Down Syndrome (DS). In the introductory part there is a need for a deeper theoretical foundation, with more current bibliographic references. Authors should also state what the research gap is and what makes the current study new and necessary.</p> <p>In the methodology part, a more detailed description of the participants is needed. More detailed information is needed regarding children, but also evaluators, those who have noticed and rated the children's sensory difficulties. It is necessary to specify the age of the children, because the characteristics of the sensory perception depend on the age, as well as the degree of disability and the therapies followed by the children with DS. As for the evaluators, it is necessary to specify their level of specialization, experience in observing and scoring such sensory characteristics.</p> <p>A subchapter of the methodology is necessary to describe in detail the procedure of observation and rating of sensory behaviors - how many evaluators were, how many observation sessions, in what contexts, how data obtained from parents were combined with those from teachers.</p> <p>In the results part, the presentation of the numerical data should be presented with only 2 decimals.</p> <p>In a scientific article, the results considered more important by the authors are not highlighted in bold.</p> <p>Some conclusions are counterintuitive - why do almost 50% of typical children have difficulty with tactile sensory integration? This result should be explained in conjunction with the findings of other studies or will put under question all the results obtained.</p> <p>In the discussion part, called similar studies, it is not enough for studies on similar topics to be presented, but conclusions must be drawn regarding the similarity or not of the results of this study with the previous ones.</p> <p>The biggest problem of this research is the inability to generalize - the sample size is so small that even if significant differences were obtained between the 2 groups, these differences and conclusions cannot be extended to a larger population, but only reflect the reality of this group of 15 children. We recommend increasing the 2 lots to at least 100 children with DS.</p> <p>In the conclusions part, please introduce the theoretical and practical implications, as well as the limits of the research.</p> <p>Bibliographic references are very few and quite old, please enlarge and update the bibliography.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

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> There are no ethical issues, but the authors must specify what ethical approval procedure was followed.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anca Luștea
Department, University & Country	West University of Timisoara, Romania