

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_111098
Title of the Manuscript:	The application of technology in the process of learning by students with special needs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript title is interesting, but the findings are missing. Sampling explains the use of focus groups, administrative personnel, teachers and parents for data collection but data result shows only data analysis from statistics websites.</p> <p>2. The title does not match the content presented in the result and discussion.  (Title Suggestion: Benefit of Incorporating Technology in Special Education)</p> <p>3. The abstract is a direct copy and paste from various portions of the body of research. Needs rephrasing. The findings of the study need to be added to the abstract.</p> <p>4. The flow needs to be reworked. There is a need to construct proper connections between the topic, methodology and findings.</p> <p>5. If language and connection are taken care Yes to some extent.</p> <p>6. Yes, references are good enough but some corrections are suggested in the paper.</p> <p>The abstract would sound better if it is restructured as suggested in the paper by including a summary of research findings. The methodology section explains that data is collected from various stakeholders but data is missing in the result.. moreover discussion presents general statistics from the website. The paper would be more presentable if actual data were presented and findings discussed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Language needs to be looked at thoroughly. Most of the portions are written in the future tense. It is pointed out in the paper in detail.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please find detailed comment on the paper</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Deepak Raj Chetri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Edith Cowan University, Bhutan</b>