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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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.** | The manuscript dives into the topic of web accessibility for individuals with disabilities, emphasizing how crucial it is to ensure that digital platforms are equally usable for everyone. It offers a comprehensive framework that combines technical execution with adherence to standards and user testing, delivering important insights for both developers and policy makers. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title representing what the manuscript is all about. Still, it could be even better with a more specific option that highlights the integration and methodological angle, such as:  “Integrated Approaches to Web Accessibility through Adaptive Systems for Users with Disabilities” |  |
| 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. | The abstract is quite well-crafted and gives a solid overview of the paper’s goals, methods, and contributions. That said, here are a few suggestions to improve it:  the prototype implementation and testing need to be added, as this is a strong point of the paper.  Highlight the uniqueness of the adaptive approach in the abstract.  Improve the clarity and impact by simplifying the last sentence slightly |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes the manuscript holds up scientifically. That said, it could really benefit from more information about the experimental sample size, demographics, and statistical significance. Adding these details would definitely enhance the study's scientific rigor and make it more reproducible. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are primarily recent and relevant, spanning from 2021 to 2025, which shows a solid engagement with the latest literature. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language used is generally clear and professional. However, there are a few minor grammatical hiccups and some awkward phrases, particularly when it comes to translating technical concepts into everyday language.   * “It's clear: content and interface are a long business...” likely a mistranslation; perhaps meant to say "content and interface must be logically structured and easy to understand." * Some formatting issues such as duplicated figures and tables |  |
| Optional/General comments | * Areas for Improvement:   + There are a few minor language and formatting inconsistencies that should be fixed.   + The abstract could do a better job of showcasing the results.   The experimental design could use more detail regarding user demographics, sample size, and the statistical methods used. | Thank you very much for your constructive and detailed comments. I fully agree with your suggestions and appreciate your acknowledgment of my manuscript's contributions. The following corrections have been made to the article based on the comments:   1. The title was changed to “Integrated Adaptive Approaches to Ensuring Accessibility of Web Applications for Users with Disabilities,” as proposed by another editor, which enhanced the informativeness and readability of the article, enabling precise search and swift orientation for specialists in the field of accessible web application development. 2. The abstract was supplemented with a description of the prototype implementation and its testing as an important practical component of the article, emphasising the uniqueness of the proposed adaptive approach. 3. Grammatical inaccuracies were corrected and awkward phrases reformulated; in particular, replacing the expression with the one proposed: “It’s clear: content and interface are a long business...,” which rendered the text more comprehensible and readable.   Inclusion of the proposed details will strengthen the methodological rigour of the research and ensure reproducibility of the obtained results. All revisions have been clearly highlighted in the updated manuscript to reflect the valuable feedback. |
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