

Review Form2

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2382
Title of the Manuscript:	A project based on Inclusive Education (Greece and Cyprus). A brief report
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article is a presentation of the researcher's postdoctoral work. The researcher has generally adequately mentioned the importance of the study and its contribution to stakeholders. In this context, it is clear that the study is valuable and will contribute to stakeholders.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the study is appropriate for the article.	
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 lacks clear statements about the results of the study. The author should present more clearly which results he/she has come up with in line with this importance. In this sense, I suggest adding a few sentences to the conclusion section in the abstract. For example, the results of the study may be able to answer each research question.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think the subheadings of the study are appropriate for the manuscript, but there should be a title about what was done during the study and the researcher should talk about the process of the study. For example, the author talks about innovations in inclusive education. What are these innovations, which application you made or which result you found supports that it is an innovation? I think the answers to these questions should be in the manuscript.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript talks about a scientific and important topic. However, it is not clear what was done and how the questions of the study were answered. For example, what pedagogical and instructional learning and training methods can be applied for inclusion? How was the answer to this question researched, what was done or observed? The author can clearly present to the reader how the answers to these questions were sought.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Current sources should be added to the relevant literature section. Current literature should be reviewed and added to the importance section.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I suggest that the manuscript be re-read by native English speakers. In some parts, sentences are unclear and lack semantic unity. I suggest careful consideration of the connections between sentences. A few of these cases are noted on the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	There is not enough evidence and findings in the manuscript for the research questions presented in the introduction. For example, it is stated that teacher opinions are included, but there is no evidence of this in the article. The editorial board should evaluate the suitability of this introductory text for your criteria for publishing a book chapter. However, I think that articles with answers to every research question we present are more academically valuable. Websites provide sufficient data for the study. However, those who read the article should have an idea of how the study was conducted without looking at these sites. In this sense, I think the methodology of the study is incomplete.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment(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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pelin Mete
Department, University & Country	Ataturk University, Turkiye