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

Yi-Fan Li[1]

1 University of Texas at San Antonio

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article "Challenges of Learners with Disabilities in Open Schools in India."

Below is a summary of the suggestions for revisions.

For the Introduction section (Open and Distance Learning, The Non-Traditional Schooling), the author(s) put an emphasis on the advantages of ODL. Since the section is the introduction of ODL, I suggested the author(s) can describe the origin of ODL, such as the history and development background. The author(s) presented a figure (Some of the major factors that affect costs in Open and Distance Learning), I am not sure how the figure relates to the introduction.

For the next section (Challenges of Learners in Open Schools in India), the author(s) said, "Arranging Education for all with equity and equality was the biggest challenge in India." Maybe the author(s) can provide more explanation or literature to support the statement. I believe readers want to know "why" if they do not understand the challenges in India.

The author(s) mentioned RTE, but what is RTE exactly?

For section 3 (Educational Provisions for CwDs in reference to provisions at the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS), India), what is CwDs? I was confused by the title a little bit.

For Research Questions, one of the research questions is about Universal Design of Learning (UDL). I think it is an abrupt transition since the author(s) did not mention any information about UDL, such as what is UDL? the history of UDL, and UDL's three principles. And there is no literature review in the Introduction section about UDL-based intervention.

Several major concerns should be addressed in research methods: 1. Questionnaire development is missing. How the

questionnaire was developed is unknown. Did the author(s) consult the previous literature? I would also want to suggest the author(s) should explain each dimension in the questionnaire. 2. Pre-test and Post-test tools should be described clearly. What is the purpose of the tests? How did the author(s) develop the tests? 3. The author(s) implemented a UDL-based intervention. Since I am also conducting UDL work in my scholarship, I would suggest the author(s) can use the UDL three principles to introduce the UDL-based intervention. The author(s) provided the preview of the modified chapter, but how about the teaching practices? Who were the interventionists and what was the intervention setting? The author(s) should provide more information about the intervention characteristics.

I wanted to provide the UDL curriculum checklist resource:http://udlselfcheck.cast.org

I believe the resource can help to prepare a UDL-based intervention and curriculum by considering the three principles of UDL.

Overall, it is good work! This manuscript definitely adds value to the literature in that it provides valuable insights regarding course accessibility for students with disabilities.

Yi-Fan Li

Assistant Professor

The University of Texas at San Antonio