



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_60392
Title of the Manuscript:	Dance Movement Therapy: Is there scope in Modern Medicine?
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	There is no need to make any compulsory revision on the paper related DMT	
Minor REVISION comments	There is no need also to make any minor revision on the paper related DMT	
Optional/General comments	<p>There may be also some photos take part in the manuscript and it could explain the theme better than its original form. But mainly...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data is well controlled and his explanations about the dance movement therapy (DMT) are also robust for me as a dancer and choreographer in the dance field. 2. Author provides his relevant and current references during his discussion in the article. 3. His discussions and its conclusions about DMT (Dance Movement Therapy) are based on actual facts and figures totally. He is so intelligent on that sense. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. There is no need to make any statistical analyses for this paper on my opinion. There have been sufficient and appropriate explanations carried out about DMT. It is a kind of gentle approach that the writers choose to explain his theme in his article. <p>CONCLUSION Conclusion has supported by his data, discussed inside his manuscript which has a title DMT. Conclusions are not biased and totally based on his data, presented inside his manuscript only. Authors provides adequate proof for his claims without overselling the theme in his manuscript. All his references cited relevant and adequate. For my opinion there are no any other suitable current references authors need to be cited in the article.</p> <p>ACCEPT</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Selçuk GÖLDERE</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Hacettepe University, Turkey</i>