

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_119492
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Learning in Robotics Teleoperation: Contribution of Eye-tracking in Digital Ethnography
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 REVISION comments</b></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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes. This study presented the pilot study, the results obtained and their analysis, as well as the discussion of their limitations and the associated perspectives, and to conclude on the relevancy of the SEBE method based on eye-tracking recording for robotics teleoperation.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Title is suitable.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. However, some of the details are missing such as name of the software used. The novelty of the study is not emphasised in this paper as well.</b></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes. However, some of the words are misspelled. Authors to correct the spelling of the some of the words.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well written. However, the problem in the conventional method used in process tracing currently and the problems in the conventional method are not explained in the paper. Furthermore, the author did not address the motivation of his/her study. Some of the words are misspelled. Author to show the equipment used and name of the software used in this study. Author is suggested to revise the paper to address these comments.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Heshalini Rajagopal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>MILA University, Malaysia</b>