

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_96093</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>QUANTITATIVE UNDERSTANDING OF DEAF CHILDREN WRITTEN FORM OF COMMUNICATION THROUGH THE USE OF WORD TYPES</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, the present study has examined the content comprehensibility and semantic level of written communication of deaf children. Hence it is recommended</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Only 3 recent studies were cited. I request the author to cite more recent articles to support the study.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes	
<b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well written to meet the scope and it is suitable for publication	

### **PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aravind B R</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Liberal Arts and Special Education, Kalasalingam Academy of Research &amp; Education, India</b>