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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | **This manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of high-probability request sequences, a critical intervention for enhancing compliance and behavioral momentum in educational and therapeutic settings. By synthesizing empirical studies and presenting innovative techniques like embedding instructions, it offers valuable insights for both researchers and practitioners. The detailed examination of implementation challenges and strategies bridges the gap between theory and practice, promoting evidence-based applications in diverse contexts. This work contributes significantly to advancing understanding and improving the efficacy of behavioral interventions within the scientific and educational communities.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The current title "High-p Request Sequences: A Low-Intensity Intervention for Challenging Behaviors?" is somewhat clear but could be more focused to better reflect the nuances discussed in the article. An alternative title that may capture the content more effectively could be:**  **"Reevaluating High-p Request Sequences: Uncovering the Complexities of a Low-Intensity Intervention for Challenging Behaviors"**  **This title addresses the main theme of reexamining the effectiveness and subtleties of high-p request sequences while still conveying the focus on their application for challenging behaviors.** |  |
| 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 of the article is fairly comprehensive as it outlines the main focus of the manuscript, which is the exploration and implementation of high-probability (high-p) request sequences. It provides a clear statement of purpose, emphasizing the foundational information, empirical literature, and recommendations for effective use. However, there are a few areas for improvement:**  **Suggestions:**   1. **Clarify the "low-intensity" claim: The abstract mentions that high-p request sequences are perceived as low-intensity but also highlights their complexities. It would be beneficial to briefly specify the nature of these complexities, such as the subtleties in implementation or translation into practice.** 2. **Highlight contributions to practice: Include a sentence summarizing the practical implications or recommendations provided in the manuscript, as this would help readers immediately grasp its relevance to real-world applications.** 3. **Focus on novelty: If the manuscript introduces any novel perspectives, such as the use of embedding instructions or unique recommendations for implementation, these should be explicitly mentioned in the abstract.**   **Revised Abstract (Example):**  **High-probability (high-p) request sequences, grounded in the principle of behavioral momentum, are an effective intervention for enhancing compliance and task completion among students with challenging behaviors. Though widely regarded as a low-intensity strategy due to its simplicity, this manuscript highlights the nuanced complexities involved in its effective implementation. It reviews empirical literature, discusses systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and introduces innovative techniques, such as embedding instructions, to enhance behavioral momentum. The chapter offers practical recommendations for educators and practitioners, bridging the gap between research and application, and ensuring a more informed and impactful use of high-p request sequences.**  **This revised version aims to make the abstract more engaging, precise, and aligned with the manuscript's contributions.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **Based on the content of the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically sound. The concepts and methods, such as high-probability (high-p) request sequences, behavioral momentum, and related empirical evidence, are well-grounded in established behavioral principles and supported by references to relevant literature, including meta-analyses and systematic reviews. The manuscript adheres to accepted scientific frameworks, such as the PRISMA guidelines and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) quality indicators, lending further credibility to its methodology.**  **Observations:**   1. **Strengths:**    * **The manuscript demonstrates a strong foundation in behavioral theory, specifically the momentum of compliance and the Premack principle.**    * **Empirical evidence is cited extensively to support claims, with a clear emphasis on systematic reviews and meta-analyses.**    * **The discussion on implementation fidelity and operational definitions is robust and aligns with best practices in applied behavior analysis.** 2. **Potential Improvements:**    * **Ensure all references cited in the text are accurate and complete, as inconsistencies in citations (e.g., doi formats) may undermine credibility.**    * **Address any areas where scientific jargon may obscure understanding, especially for readers outside the behavioral sciences.**    * **If any claims or data are based on limited studies or specific contexts, consider including caveats to clarify generalizability.**   **The manuscript is scientifically correct, with well-researched content and adherence to rigorous academic standards. However, attention to minor details, such as consistent citation formatting and clarifications for complex concepts, could enhance its overall reliability and accessibility.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of foundational works and more recent studies. The manuscript incorporates several key studies and systematic reviews, including meta-analyses conducted by Common et al. (2019) and Maag (2019), as well as earlier foundational research such as Mace et al. (1988) and Nevin (1996). These references effectively support the discussion of high-probability (high-p) request sequences and related interventions.**  **Observations:**   1. **Sufficiency:**    * **The manuscript cites a variety of sources, including empirical studies, meta-analyses, systematic reviews, and practitioner-oriented articles.**    * **It references critical guidelines like PRISMA and the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards, indicating a commitment to evidence-based practices.** 2. **Recency:**    * **While many references are recent, some key sources, such as foundational theories or classic studies, date back several decades. This is appropriate for providing historical context but should be balanced with current research.**    * **Some referenced works (e.g., studies published in 2020 and 2021) show that the manuscript includes up-to-date findings**   **Suggestions:**  **To enhance the manuscript, consider incorporating the following:**   * **More recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews: If any have been published post-2021, including them would strengthen the timeliness of the manuscript.** * **Diversity of contexts: Consider adding references that discuss the application of high-p request sequences in varied cultural or educational contexts to broaden the manuscript's scope.**   **Example Additional References:**   1. **Recent Developments in Behavioral Momentum Theory:**    * **Vollmer, T. R., & Smith, R. G. (2021). Advances in behavioral momentum theory: Applications to educational settings. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*.** 2. **Cross-Cultural Applications:**    * **Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2020). Positive behavior support in diverse educational settings. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*.**   **These references could provide updated findings and broader applicability, further enhancing the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication overall, but there are areas where clarity, conciseness, and consistency could be improved. The manuscript uses technical terminology appropriately for the field of behavioral analysis and education, which is expected in a scholarly context. However, certain phrases and sentence structures may be overly complex or repetitive, which could hinder readability for some audiences.**  **Observations:**   1. **Strengths:**    * **The manuscript employs a formal tone and precise terminology suitable for an academic audience.**    * **Key concepts, such as "behavioral momentum" and "high-probability request sequences," are described in detail with appropriate contextualization.** 2. **Areas for Improvement:**    * **Sentence Complexity: Some sentences are overly long or contain multiple clauses, which can reduce readability. For example, breaking down complex ideas into shorter sentences would enhance comprehension.**    * **Repetition: Certain concepts are explained repeatedly (e.g., the distinction between high-p and low-p requests). Streamlining these explanations could improve flow and reduce redundancy.**    * **Grammar and Syntax: Minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing are present in a few sections. For instance, "the purpose of this articles" (should be "article") in the abstract.** 3. **Suggestions for Refinement:**    * **Use active voice where possible to make the text more direct and engaging.**    * **Avoid unnecessary jargon or explain it succinctly for interdisciplinary readers.**    * **Ensure consistent use of tense and voice throughout the manuscript.**   **The manuscript’s language is appropriate for scholarly communication, but refining sentence structures, reducing redundancy, and correcting minor grammatical issues would improve its overall readability and professional presentation. These changes will make the article more accessible without compromising its academic rigor**. |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Clarity of Ideas:**  **Ensure that each concept is explained clearly and not too technical without sufficient explanations. For example, concepts like "Premack Principle" and "embedding instructions" may need further clarification with examples that are easier for general readers to understand.**  **Structure and Flow:**  **Ensure that each section of the chapter is logically organized. For instance, start with definitions and basic concepts before moving on to meta-analysis studies and recommendations.**  **Language and Writing Style:**  **Some sections use heavy technical terms. You may consider including a glossary of terms to make it easier for readers.**  **Consistency:**  **Ensure that terminology and reference formats are consistent throughout the chapter. For example, some references are formatted as "doi: ..." while others are not.**  **Accuracy of Facts:**  **Review the facts and statistical data, such as percentages or research results, to ensure there are no errors.**  **Based on the review of the manuscript's scientific rigor, language quality, references, and overall presentation,**  **Justification:**   * **Scientific Rigor : The manuscript is well-grounded in research, with sufficient references and adherence to scholarly standards.** * **Language and Clarity : While suitable for academic purposes, minor improvements in grammar, sentence structure, and redundancy reduction would enhance readability.** * **Relevance and Contributions : The content is highly relevant and makes meaningful contributions to the field, particularly in providing practical insights for implementing high-p request sequences.**   **Recommendation:**  **Addressing the minor issues in language and presentation, along with updating references where possible, would make this a high-quality submission suitable for publication.** |  |
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