

The Impact of Moral Education Interventions on Adolescents' Sociomoral Reasoning Skills

Sefa. Bulut¹, Fitim. Uka^{2,3,4}, Mehdi. Rostami^{5*}, Sergii Boltivets⁶

¹ Department of Counseling Psychology & Head of Student Counseling Center, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Türkiye
² Munich Centre for Learning Sciences, Department of Learning Sciences, Ludwing MaximilianUniversity, Munich, 80802, Germany
³ epartment of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina", Prishtina,10000, Kosovo
⁴ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada
⁶ Chief Researcher of the Department of Scientific Support of Social Formation of Youth. Mykhailo Drahomanov University, Ukraine

* Corresponding author email address: mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

Editor	R e v i e w e r s
Mary Helen Kosmidis	Reviewer 1: Ioannis Liampas [®]
Laboratory of Cognitive	Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Larissa, School of Medicine,
Neuroscience, School of	University of Thessaly,41100 Larissa, Greece. Email: bill_s1983@hotmail.com
Psychology, Aristotle University of	Reviewer 2: Georgios M. Hadjigeorgiou
Thessaloniki,54124 Thessaloniki,	Department of Neurology, Medical School, University of Cyprus, 2408 Nicosia,
Greece	Cyprus. Email: hadjigeorgiou.georgios@ucy.ac.cy
kosmidis@psy.auth.gr	

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The research question could be refined for clarity and specificity. It's recommended to clearly define any technical terms or concepts introduced and to articulate how this research addresses a gap in the existing literature.

The manuscript occasionally diverges into tangential discussions. Streamlining these sections to maintain a focus on the central argument will enhance readability and coherence. Ensure each paragraph contributes directly to your research objectives.

The literature review is thorough but could benefit from incorporating more recent studies to provide a comprehensive overview of current research in this area. Highlighting how your work builds upon or diverges from these studies will strengthen your argument.

Some data presentation elements (e.g., tables, figures) could be simplified for clarity. Consider revising these elements for accessibility and ensure they directly support the narrative. Additionally, a more detailed analysis could provide deeper insights into your findings.

The methodology section would benefit from more detailed descriptions, especially regarding data collection and analysis techniques. Providing more context on the choice of methodology and its implementation will improve the manuscript's rigor.

Expanding the discussion on the implications of your findings and their limitations will provide a more balanced view. It's crucial to contextualize your results within the broader field and discuss potential avenues for future research.

Attention to grammatical details and adherence to the journal's formatting guidelines is necessary. A thorough proofreading session can help eliminate typographical errors and ensure consistency throughout the manuscript.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Clarify the research question and ensure it's grounded in the literature review. Maintain focus on the central argument, removing or revising tangential sections. Update the literature review with recent studies and articulate how your work contributes to the field. Simplify data presentation for ease of understanding and delve deeper into the analysis. Provide comprehensive methodological details for reproducibility and clarity. Discuss the implications and limitations of your findings in greater depth. Conduct a thorough proofreading and formatting review according to journal guidelines.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

