

## 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

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>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>Awareness about the presence of gaps in language skills of deaf students would help the mentors design newer methods to teaching deaf students. hence the manuscript does make effective contribution to the scientific society</b> <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b> <b>Results and discussion could be separate for better comprehension</b>  <b>The method adopted is justified.</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Would like to know if ethical clearance was received from the institution. As deaf students come under the category of vulnerable population and below 18 yrs again special consent (assent) need to be taken . but the author has mentioned that they were not aware that they are part of the study. Is it ethically right ? the study is quite good but I feel ethical standards need to be maintained.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> <b>As deaf students come under the category of vulnerable population and below 18 yrs again special consent (assent) need to be taken . but the author has mentioned that they were not aware that they are part of the study. Is it ethically right ? the study is quite good but I feel ethical standards need to be maintained.</b>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Biju Bahuleyan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>KUHS, India</b>