

Review of: "Challenges of Learners with Disabilities in Open Schools in India"

Guy Le Fanu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you providing me with the opportunity to review your paper "Challenges of Learners with Disabilities in Open Schools in India".

My review will be relatively short as reviews have already been provided by seven experts and I do not wish to repeat what has already been said.

For me, the most interesting – and exciting – part of this paper is the discussion of the modifications to the learning materials involving:

- Breaking down complex sentences into simpler ones
- Providing a visual dictionary of keywords
- Using short sentences and pointers
- Using images, flow charts, tables, and graphs
- Use of mnemonics
- Adding in-text questions.

Thank you for including visuals of the adapted materials in your article. Congratulations! They look attractive, engaging, and accessible. However, it would have been useful if you had provided more information about the materials and how extensive your changes were.

The test scores of the experimental group were superior to those of the control group. (You refer to the post-test scores, but I think you mean the test scores.) Are you sure that this was solely because the experimental group accessed study material adapted according to UDL principles? Were other forms of support provided to the experimental group? Or were the experimental group more able or better taught in the past than the control group? It is of course essential that that you show the adapted study materials were responsible for these results, especially if you want to persuade National Institute of Open Schooling – and other educational organisations – to incorporate UDL perspectives in their learning materials.

It would also be useful if you could describe what further research is needed to establish the efficacy of learning materials adapted according to UDL materials. For instance, is there a need to trial the materials with a larger sample of students with a greater range of functional difficulties from a broader range of schools, perhaps under more controlled conditions?

As the focus of your paper is adapting learning materials for children with disabilities according to UDL principles, you may

wish to consider changing the title of your paper.

I have a few additional points to make.

1. Please can you refer to persons with disability and children with disability, not PWD and CWD, as the former is more respectful. You do not need to capitalise persons with disability and children with disability, as you occasionally do in the text.
2. It would be good if you could have said more about the National Institute of Open Schooling and the open school system in India generally – as many readers outside the country will be unfamiliar with these entities. It would also have been good if you could have said more about RTE.
3. You use a lot of acronyms. This is confusing and frustrating at times. To what are you referring? The first time you use an acronym in a paper, please provide the words on which these acronyms are based. At one stage you refer to ODL (in section 10.2) when I think you mean UDL.
4. Some of the citations in the text are not in the reference list at the end.
5. I found it hard to understand certain phrases and sentences – for instance, “a need of an hour of dynamic learners of today’s times”; “the learning of learners of kindergarten to higher education...”; and “hence, it was observed as a major concern and legislations and policies were placed as the legal intervention makes the process of bringing inclusion easier.” It is recommended that you revise your paper so the language is as clear and accessible as possible.

In conclusion, many thanks for giving me the opportunity to review your thought-provoking paper.