

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2440
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Psychoeducational Intervention Models in Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This chapter addresses a very important topic in the context of psychopedagogical intervention in ASD: analysis of the psychoeducational intervention models. There are numerous interventions developed for the students with ASD. it is important to review and critically analyzethree of them, with recommendations based on scientific evidence regarding their effectiveness in various contexts.I liked the manuscript for its scientific rigor of the statistical analysis. I would have liked more to describe the three types of interventions, because they are not the most recognized and analyzed in relation to ASD. Also, the English language is cumbersome, with long and convoluted sentences and hard to follow.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title seems too general to me, can be understood that the analysis is made of all psychoeducational interventions for ASD. I would recommend Analysis of three Psychoeducational Intervention Models for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder	
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.	In the abstract, I would recommend detailing the part of the results more, specifying precisely the main results obtained. Also, the most important recommendation arising from the results should be mentioned.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, I would recommend the introduction of the limitation in the discussion part.	
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.	The presented research is methodically correct in all aspects and presents the research and its results in a comprehensive, structured scientific manner. The method is described in detail. The research design is correct. The assessment methods are valid for research purposes. The results are presented in a structured manner and using advanced statistical analisys. The discussion section offers interpretations of the results. My only sugestion is the recommendations from the conclusion part are too general, should be specific from the result obtained.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The bibliographic references are not more recent than 2016, this chapter is a presentation of an article published in 2017 and the authors have not updated the bibliographic references	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is scientific, but the English language is cumbersome, with long and convoluted sentences and hard to follow.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Anca Luștrea
Department, University & Country	West University of Timisoara, Romania