

Effectiveness of a Motor Rehabilitation Program on Proprioception and Visuospatial Processing in Children with Intellectual Developmental Disabilities


Ommehleila. Aryan¹, Samira. Vakili^{2*}, Mohammadparsa. Azizi², Maryam. Asaseh²

¹ PhD Student, Department of Psychology and Education of Exceptional Children, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Education of Exceptional Children, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran


* Corresponding author email address: Vakili7sa@gmail.com

Editor

Shokouh Navabinejad
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada

sh.navabinejad@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani

Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Masoud Asadi

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran.

Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the statement, "Proprioception is essential for effective muscle control and voluntary movement," the term "essential" may be too strong without supporting evidence. Consider citing specific studies that underscore this claim.

The criteria for participant exclusion (e.g., "students who used stimulant medication") seem underexplained. Provide reasoning or references to justify these exclusions.

The intervention description lacks detail about how exercises were tailored to individual participant needs. Were there modifications for differing abilities or challenges?

Table 1 contains valuable information but does not explain why certain variables (e.g., SD) are relevant to understanding the intervention's effects. Consider a brief discussion of this in the text.

In Figure 3, the statement "indicates a lasting effect on the proprioceptive depth of children" uses terminology ("proprioceptive depth") that is ambiguous. Define or rephrase for precision.

The reference to rhythmic motor exercises (paragraph 8) is insightful but lacks connection to the results. Were rhythmic exercises a part of this study's intervention, or is this extrapolated?

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The explanation of visuospatial processing (paragraph 4) is comprehensive but dense. Breaking it into two paragraphs may enhance readability and emphasize the importance of visuospatial abilities.

"Numerous studies using either a single physical activity session..." cites prior research but lacks specificity. Including examples or references to specific studies would add credibility.

The rationale for selecting an age range of 7–12 years is logical but should explicitly connect to developmental milestones or existing research to strengthen justification.

The section on proprioception measurement (Autocad-based imaging technique) is highly technical. Adding a brief explanation of why this method was chosen over alternatives could improve understanding.

While the Stanford-Binet test is described well, further clarification on how its verbal and nonverbal scores directly relate to visuospatial processing would be helpful.

The claim, "Creative and effective activities can be used to enhance proprioception," would benefit from specific examples of "creative and effective activities" to support the argument.

The explanation of neuroplasticity (paragraph 5) is intriguing but needs more explicit connections to the findings. How does this study contribute to understanding neuroplastic changes?

The sentence, "Structured developmental and functional stages for children with impairments," should be linked directly to how this structure specifically impacted proprioception and visuospatial processing in the study.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.