

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55232

Title: A Study on the Current Needs in the Area of Dysgraphia, Early Identification and Early Intervention.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity		✓		
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents a comprehensive literature-based examination of dysgraphia with particular emphasis on early identification and early intervention in the Indian context. The topic is timely, policy-relevant, and well-supported by national and international literature. The paper demonstrates strong conceptual grounding; however, improvements are required in organization, language precision, and analytical synthesis to strengthen its scholarly contribution.

Recommendation: Accept after minor revision.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

STRENGTHS

1. The study addresses an important and under-recognized area within Specific Learning Disabilities, particularly dysgraphia.
2. The manuscript demonstrates strong conceptual clarity through integration of DSM-5, ICD-11, RCI, and RPwD Act frameworks.
3. Extensive national and international literature is reviewed, highlighting prevalence, overlap conditions, and intervention practices.
4. The alignment of recommendations with NEP 2020 strengthens the policy relevance of the study.
5. The paper clearly identifies gaps in Indian research and justifies the need for a context-specific identification and intervention module.

WEAKNESSES

1. The manuscript is lengthy and would benefit from condensation to improve focus and readability.
2. The discussion is largely descriptive, with limited critical synthesis across reviewed studies.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. Methodological justification for literature selection and thematic analysis requires clearer articulation.
4. Some sections repeat similar arguments, particularly regarding prevalence and policy gaps.
5. Language and grammatical inconsistencies are present and require careful editorial revision.