

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_130604
Title of the Manuscript:	Employing Ubiquitous Learning among Autistic Children
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript explores the integration of ubiquitous learning (U-learning) to address the educational challenges of autistic children. By emphasizing U-learning's adaptability, it contributes to inclusive education, offering insights into personalized syllabus design for sensory and cognitive needs. The use of the Wisconsin Scale provides a structured approach for effective interventions, aiding educators, therapists, and researchers. The study highlights how technology-driven education enhances skill generalization, independence, and confidence, advancing knowledge in special education.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Employing Ubiquitous Learning among Autistic Children," conveys the main theme but could be more precise and engaging. The phrase "Employing Ubiquitous Learning" might not fully capture the significance of the study in addressing educational challenges for autistic children. Alternative Title: "Harnessing Ubiquitous Learning to Support Autistic Children's Educational Needs"	Title revised

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The abstract is generally well-structured and provides an overview of the study, but it could be improved for better clarity, completeness, and impact.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement. The abstract does not provide an overview of how the research was conducted. Adding a brief mention of methods (e.g., analysis framework, participant details, or assessment tools like fMRI and ATEC) would enhance its credibility. The abstract lacks specific expected or observed outcomes. Redundant or Ambiguous Phrasing – Some parts could be streamlined for clarity (e.g., "The paper dwells at length, the issues and possibilities..." could be reworded to be more precise).</p> <p>Simplify the explanation of syllabus customization without excessive detail.</p> <p>Avoid repetition of challenges faced by autistic children since they are already introduced.</p>	<p>Noted and effected</p> <p>OK</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript is well-researched and presents a compelling discussion on the application of ubiquitous learning (U-learning) for autistic children. The paper clearly defines Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), its challenges, and how U-learning can address them. The discussion on using mobile apps, fMRI, and assistive technology is relevant and aligns with modern approaches to special education. The manuscript correctly mentions tools such as the Wisconsin Scale, ADOS-2, and ASRS, which are widely used for autism. The focus on individualized syllabus design for autistic children is a valid and scientifically supported approach.</p> <p>However.</p> <p>The paper discusses U-learning but does not sufficiently explain how it improves cognitive and social skills in autistic children.</p> <p>While the manuscript references autism assessment tools and scales, it does not cite specific experimental studies or statistical data to support claims about the effectiveness of U-learning for ASD. Example: The claim that U-learning enhances language skills and social interaction needs empirical validation through quantitative or qualitative research studies.</p> <p>The manuscript interchanges "illness" and "disorder", but autism is scientifically classified as a neurodevelopmental disorder, not an illness. This should be corrected for accuracy. Example: "The severity of the illness ranges from levels 1 to 3..." should be changed to "The severity of the disorder ranges from levels 1 to 3..."</p> <p>The manuscript suggests using fMRI to assess cognitive improvements in autistic children, but it does not explain why fMRI is necessary for this study. The paper should clarify how fMRI findings would directly contribute to evaluating the effectiveness of U-learning.</p> <p>The manuscript cites Wikipedia as a source for autism prevalence, which is not a reliable scientific source. Instead, prevalence data should be cited from peer-reviewed journals, CDC reports, or WHO statistics.</p> <p>While the abstract and introduction discuss the need for a personalized syllabus, there is no structured methodology section detailing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- How participants were selected- What experimental design was used- How results were measured	<p>Revision made accordingly</p> <p>Corrected as suggested</p> <p>Revision made</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references in the manuscript include a mix of recent studies and older foundational works, but there are some gaps and issues that should be addressed to ensure the manuscript is well-supported by up-to-date and authoritative sources. Insufficient Citation of Empirical U-Learning Studies for Autism. Include recent peer-reviewed studies on U-learning applications in special education, particularly those focused on mobile-assisted learning, adaptive learning environments, and technology-driven interventions for autism. The manuscript mentions fMRI as a tool for evaluating language and social skills in autistic children, but it does not cite any studies that validate the use of fMRI in an educational context. Include neuroscience studies that have used fMRI to study language processing and social cognition in ASD. Adding recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses on autism intervention strategies would improve the paper's scientific credibility. Include more recent research (from 2018–2024) on AI, VR, and mobile-based interventions for ASD.</p>	<p>Done revision</p>

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The manuscript is mostly clear and understandable, but it has several grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and structural issues that need improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication.</p> <p>There are several grammar mistakes, misplaced commas, and awkward sentence constructions that make certain sections harder to read. Example. "The paper dwells at length, the issues and possibilities of designing a syllabus, based on Ubiquitous learning, taking into consideration, their medical conditions." (Misuse of commas).</p> <p>Some phrases are unnecessarily long or repetitive, reducing readability. Example. "Autistic children have various issues like visual, auditory or tactile issues in handling gadgets and hence a unique syllabus is tailor made for each child taking care of their difficulties."</p> <p>The manuscript sometimes refers to autism as an "illness", which is scientifically incorrect. Autism is a neurodevelopmental disorder, not a disease or illness. Replace "illness" with "condition" or "disorder" throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Some quotes from sources are dropped into the text without integration, making them feel disconnected.</p> <p>Instead of:</p> <p>"...the varied use of technology for children with autism continues to receive limited attention, despite the fact that technology tends to be a high-interest area for many of these children." (Nissan B. Bar-Lev, 2001)</p> <p>Better integration:</p> <p>Nissan B. Bar-Lev (2001) notes that despite technology being a high-interest area for autistic children, its application in education remains underexplored.</p> <p>The manuscript requires grammatical corrections, restructuring of awkward sentences, and improved academic transitions to meet the standards of scholarly writing.</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revision made as suggested</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Manuscript presents an important and timely discussion on the role of Ubiquitous Learning (U-learning) in supporting autistic children, and it offers valuable insights into syllabus customization, assistive technology, and assessment frameworks.</p> <p>However.</p> <p>While the manuscript provides a solid conceptual foundation, it lacks empirical validation for some claims, particularly regarding the effectiveness of U-learning for autistic children.</p> <p>The manuscript does not explicitly state a structured methodology, which may make it difficult for readers to assess how the conclusions were reached.</p> <p>Include a dedicated methodology section that clearly outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Participant demographics (if applicable).- Data collection methods (e.g., surveys, fMRI, ATEC analysis).- Assessment criteria for evaluating U-learning outcomes. <p>The manuscript contains grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and redundant wording, which can impact clarity and readability.</p> <p>The paper introduces U-learning but does not fully explore how it compares to other learning models used for autism education (e.g., ABA therapy, TEACCH method, or gamification strategies). Include a brief comparison or mention how U-learning complements existing ASD teaching strategies.</p> <p>The manuscript includes some outdated references and a Wikipedia citation, which should be replaced with more reliable and peer-reviewed sources.</p> <p>The manuscript suggests using fMRI to assess cognitive improvements in autistic children, but it does not provide a strong justification for why this tool is necessary in an educational context. Explain why fMRI is relevant, cite prior studies that used neuroimaging for educational assessment, or consider alternative assessment tools (e.g., behavioral tracking, eye-tracking technology).</p>	<p>Revised</p>

Review Form 3

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