

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 |

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the manuscript can probably contribute to the scientific community. However, this work does not meet the standard which can make a valuable contribution to the scientific community. The title of the article does not completely reflect the author's work/study. Digital Ethnography primarily deals with social and cultural domains of human interaction over the internet via social media. I am not completely sure how this applies to this work. The abstract of the article is well constructed. I see some discrepancies in the Introduction section, some missing references "a "recall effect [...] probably due to the nature of episodic memory [...]" other than that the subsection and the structure of the manuscript seem correct. Also see additional comments section. The scientific correctness of the manuscript is debatable. Since it's the first of its kind, it will be harder to gauge the correctness of the manuscript. But by its own, there could be some improvements by adding mathematical expressions on how the matrices of competencies has been derived. Most of the references are recent. The number of references is also sufficient. <p>Additional Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 2, Overview of the maze. A top view picture would be much better. A person having 11+ years of experience at the job could not possibly be novice pilot. In the Result and Discussion section, the authors claim to be able to establish matrices of competencies for each of the pilots but fail to explain how or what kind of questions were asked, no such data is provided. The experiment has been conducted with only 2 people which is the diminutive sample size, hence, statistically not great data to back up the author's claim which the authors also agree to. In the Result and Discussion section, the authors claim that "gaze fixation time is 41% longer for the novice pilot compared to the experienced pilot" but the same is not represented on the Table 2. On Table 2. the data is referenced as "total fixation duration (s)". Probably a good idea to change that to "total gaze fixation duration". The authors claim "This pilot study showed the added-value of applying a SEBE method integrating eye-tracking in robotic teleoperation to improve pilot training" but failed to provide evidence or study proving so, which authors also agree to. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>The language/English meets the bare minimum criteria for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Name: | Min Raj Nepali |
| Department, University & Country | United States |