

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3717
Title of the Manuscript:	Concept mapping as a Pedagogical tool in Differentiated Teaching Practice for Students with Learning Disabilities
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of this manuscript lies in its potential contribution to the field of differentiated instruction, specifically in science education for students with learning disabilities. By presenting an empirical study of concept mapping as a pedagogical tool in a Greek high school context, the manuscript provides evidence that can inform both policy makers and educators interested in inclusive education practices. It demonstrates the effectiveness of concept mapping in enhancing the comprehension of complex physics concepts for students with learning disabilities, which has implications for improving teaching strategies and learning outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Concept Mapping as a Pedagogical Tool in Differentiated Teaching Practice for Students with Learning Disabilities," is appropriate as it clearly states the subject and focus of the paper. However, consider making it more specific by adding a context like "in Greek High Schools" to provide additional context to the readers.	
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 quite comprehensive, but it could benefit from slightly clearer structure. I suggest explicitly stating the two phases of the study (experimental and control), and summarizing the main findings in a more direct format. Adding a sentence on the potential implications of these findings would also strengthen the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is generally well-organized, with clear distinctions between different sections such as the introduction, theoretical background, methodology, and results. The use of subheadings helps guide the reader, but I recommend improving the "Discussion" section by linking the findings more directly to the literature reviewed.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically sound and robust. The experimental design, which includes a control phase and systematic data collection using pre-tests and post-tests, provides a solid basis for evaluating the effectiveness of concept mapping. The comparison between concept mapping and traditional instruction was clearly documented, and the findings were presented in a statistically meaningful way. It would be helpful to add more information on how potential biases (such as observer influence) were minimized during the experimental phase.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are appropriate, recent, and cover the necessary theoretical background and related studies. However, it may be useful to add more recent studies on differentiated instruction techniques in inclusive classrooms, especially in science education.	

[Review Form2](#)

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor Revision Comments Language/English Quality: The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Some minor grammatical issues and typos need attention (e.g., "defi ne" should be "define" in the abstract). Additionally, some sentences could be simplified for better readability. Consider revising for conciseness in some sections, especially the discussion, to improve clarity.	
Optional/General comments	Reasoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The manuscript has a solid research design and addresses an important area in inclusive education with valuable contributions.• Minor revisions are needed in terms of language refinement, additional contextual detail in the title, and minor improvements in the abstract and discussion sections. Thank you for your interesting contribution to the field of differentiated teaching in science education. Your focus on concept mapping as an instructional tool for students with learning disabilities is both timely and valuable. The case study provides insightful findings that can help educators enhance their pedagogical strategies.	

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:	Nirumala Rothinam
Department, University & Country	School of Postgraduates, Quest International University, Malaysia