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| PART 1: Review Comments |
| Compulsory REVISION 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. 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 relies on the rare topic it addresses. Discussing issues related to students with special needs is itself worth-investigating. It sheds light on the problems these students (puiples in the case of this study) face and/or will be facing.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **I would suggest “ Pedagogical Stakes and Challenges Face Cameroni Puiples with Auditory Problems: Psycholinguistic Perspective.” Instead.****The reason is that the method followed is, roughly speaking, pedagogical and we are not about the degrees and seriousness of each case in question (auditory-wise) under the psycholinguistic framework.** |  |
| 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. | **I don’t think so. I think it is little bit vague and that the researcher should write in scientific language some bold statements.**  |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Good enough** |  |
| **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.** | **In principle, the work is good. However, it lacks important touches. For instance, the introductory part should tell us as readers what the researcher is going to talk about. The methodology should explain how and why this investigation will be tackled and the analytic part should in/validate that and the last role of the researcher is to make outcomes readable in the conlclusive part to be able to drive me as a reader to see how his recommendations applicable and that what I didn’t find meticulously.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The references are another problem: They are not cntemporary (some are not even modern). They should be more focused on the topic under investigation.**  |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is good but it needs to more descriptive than narrative. (I would advise the researcher to use simple present tense, namely when desriping a scientific phenomenon. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The study is good and acceptable generally and particularly. It could be very good (even excellent) though if the researcher takes into account all the comments. |  |
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