



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O):2320-5407|ISSN(P):3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55442

**Title:** Comparative Perspectives on Aerobics and Yoga in Enhancing Physical and Cognitive Development of Children with Down Syndrome: A Thematic Review.

**Recommendation:**

Accept after minor revision

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sudheer Aluru

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

This manuscript presents a thematic narrative review comparing aerobics and yoga as physical activity-based interventions for enhancing physical, cognitive, and psychosocial development in children with Down syndrome (DS). The topic is **timely, relevant, and appropriate** focusing on special education, developmental disabilities, rehabilitation, or inclusive education.

The manuscript is **conceptually sound, well-structured, and clearly written**, with appropriate use of literature and policy contextualization (NEP 2020, RPwD Act 2016). Unlike empirical studies, the authors correctly position this work as a thematic/narrative review, which reduces methodological risk.

However, the manuscript would benefit from greater methodological transparency, deeper critical synthesis, and clearer articulation of its review framework to strengthen academic rigor and credibility.

#### Major Comments

##### 1. Review Methodology Is Insufficiently Described

While the paper is described as a "thematic review," there is **no description of how literature was identified, selected, or synthesized**.

#### Concerns:

- No databases mentioned (e.g., PubMed, Scopus, ERIC)
- No inclusion/exclusion criteria
- No timeframe or keyword strategy
- No explanation of how themes were derived

**REVIEWER'S REPORT****Required revision:**

- Add a short subsection (even 1 paragraph) titled “Review Methodology” describing:
  - Type of review (narrative/thematic)
  - Databases searched
  - Time period covered
  - Inclusion focus (children with DS, physical activity, yoga/aerobics)
  - How themes were identified

This is essential for scholarly transparency, even in non-systematic reviews.

**2. Limited Critical Appraisal of Evidence**

The manuscript primarily **summarizes positive findings** of aerobicics and yoga without sufficient critical evaluation.

**Concerns:**

- No discussion of:
  - Small sample sizes
  - Heterogeneity of interventions
  - Variability in outcome measures
  - Limited DS-specific randomized evidence

**Required revision:**

- Include a brief **critical appraisal paragraph**, noting:
  - Strengths and weaknesses of existing studies
  - Gaps in evidence specific to DS
  - Over-reliance on extrapolation from broader developmental disability literature

This will elevate the paper from *descriptive* to *analytical*.

**3. Overgeneralization of Cognitive Outcomes**

Some cognitive claims (e.g., improved memory, problem-solving, learning readiness) are stated confidently, but the **evidence base in children with DS is relatively limited and indirect**.

**Required revision:**

- Use cautious language such as:
  - “associated with”
  - “suggested to support”
  - “may contribute to”
- Clarify when findings are:
  - DS-specific
  - Extrapolated from broader developmental disability or general child populations

**REVIEWER'S REPORT****4. Thematic Synthesis Table Needs Strengthening**

The thematic synthesis table is helpful but oversimplifies complex outcomes. Suggestions:

- Add a column or footnote noting:
  - Strength of evidence (e.g., moderate, emerging)
  - Nature of outcomes (physical vs behavioral vs proxycognitive outcomes)

This would significantly improve scholarly depth.

**Minor Comments****1. Consistency and Language**

- Minor typographical issues (spacing, "Aerobic exercise")
- Ensure consistent pluralization (aerobics vs aerobic exercise)

**2. Policy Discussion**

- The NEP and RPwD discussion is valuable but could be slightly condensed to maintain focus on empirical evidence.

**3. Conclusion**

- Strong overall, but could explicitly restate:
  - That this is a thematic synthesis, not a meta-analysis
  - That recommendations are informed by trends, not effect sizes