



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57161

Title: ASSESSING IMPACT OF UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING BASED INTERVENTIONS ON READING COMPETENCIES OF STUDENTS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	√			
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity	√			
Significance	√			

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This is a **well-executed, clearly written, and methodologically sound** systematic review. The paper addresses an important and timely topic—inclusive literacy instruction for students with intellectual disabilities—and provides a valuable synthesis of current evidence. The author demonstrates strong command of the UDL framework and relevant literature. The review is structured logically, objectives are clearly stated, and findings are presented thematically.

The paper requires only **minor revisions** before acceptance. These include correcting a few formatting errors, clarifying methodological details, and strengthening the discussion of Indian contextual factors.

Strengths

- Clear Research Questions and Objectives:** Four specific objectives guide the review, and each is addressed systematically in the results section.
- Methodologically Sound:** Inclusion/exclusion criteria are specified; 15 peer-reviewed studies from 2010–2024 are analyzed; thematic synthesis is appropriate.
- Strong Conceptual Framework:** UDL principles (multiple means of representation, engagement, action/expression) are clearly linked to reading instruction components.
- Practical Implications:** Concrete recommendations for teachers, schools, and teacher education programs are provided.
- Contextual Relevance:** The focus on Indian educational policy (RPwD Act 2016, NEP 2020) and resource constraints adds value for the journal's likely audience.
- Well-Organized:** Clear section headings, logical flow, and accessible academic writing.

Weaknesses & Required Revisions (Minor)

1. Duplicate Text (Critical Error to Fix)

- Issue (Page 9, lines 259–272):** Objective 4 is presented incorrectly. Lines 259–262 repeat Objective 3 verbatim, then lines 263–272 repeat the same text again. The actual findings for Objective 4 (practical implications for India) appear to be missing or merged incorrectly.
- Suggestion:** Replace lines 259–272 with a proper synthesis of practical implications for the Indian context, drawing from the Discussion section (lines 288–295 and Educational Implications section). The current duplication is a clear editorial error.

2. Missing PRISMA or Flow Diagram

- Issue:** The methodology states that fifteen studies were selected, but no search flow diagram or detailed screening process is provided. Number of studies identified initially, excluded, and reasons for exclusion are not reported.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Suggestion:** Add a brief PRISMA-style flow diagram or a paragraph describing: initial hits, duplicates removed, title/abstract screening, full-text review, and final included studies with reasons for exclusion.

3. Limited Detail on Study Quality Assessment

- **Issue:** The review does not mention any critical appraisal or quality assessment of included studies (e.g., risk of bias, study design quality, sample size adequacy).
- **Suggestion:** Add a sentence or two stating that studies were assessed for methodological quality (e.g., using appropriate tools like the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool or a simple internal validity checklist). Acknowledge that heterogeneity limited meta-analysis.

4. Minor Formatting and Typographical Issues

- **Page 3, line 72:** "Indiraemains" appears as a typo in line 190 (page 6). Correct to "India remains".
- **Page 7, line 191:** "Methodology-" has an extra hyphen. Change to "Methodology".
- **Page 8, line 220:** "perme- . mediated reading" – should read "peer-mediated reading".
- **Page 9, line 248:** "persona lised" – remove space: "personalised".
- **Page 12, line 349:** "moderate- to- severe" – inconsistent hyphenation. Use "moderate to severe" or "moderate-to-severe" consistently.

5. Underdeveloped Discussion of Indian Context

- **Issue:** The paper repeatedly mentions the Indian context (objectives, implications) but the reviewed studies are primarily international. Only a few Indian studies (Das & Gupta, 2017; Gupta & Sharma, 2018; Kaur & Sharma, 2019; Malhotra & Aggarwal, 2020) are cited. The review does not clearly state how many of the 15 included studies are from India.
- **Suggestion:** In the methodology or results, specify: "Of the 15 studies, X were conducted in India, Y in other countries." In the discussion, explicitly compare findings from Indian vs. international contexts and note any cultural or resource-based differences.

6. Missing Information on Participant Characteristics

- **Issue:** The review does not summarize the age ranges, grade levels, or severity levels of ID across the 15 studies. This limits understanding of applicability.
- **Suggestion:** Add a table (as an appendix or in results) summarizing each study: authors, year, country, sample size, ID severity (mild/moderate/severe), age/grade, UDL strategies used, reading outcomes measured, and key findings.

7. Minor Redundancy

- **Issue:** The first paragraph of the Discussion (lines 283–287) restates findings already presented in Results. The second paragraph (lines 288–295) introduces new contextual factors. Consider condensing.
- **Suggestion:** Keep the contextual discussion; reduce repetition of results.

8. Citation Consistency

- **Page 13, line 375:** Das & Gupta (2017) – page range "45-52" is fine, but ensure all references follow consistent journal title formatting (some italicized, some not). Check APA 7th or journal-specific style.

Recommendation for the Editor

Accept after minor revision.

This is a high-quality systematic review that makes a meaningful contribution to the literature on inclusive literacy instruction for students with intellectual disabilities. The paper is theoretically sound, well-organized, and practically relevant, particularly for the Indian educational context. The required revisions are minimal and primarily editorial:

1. **Fix the duplicate text error** on page 9 (Objective 4 section) – this is essential.
2. Add a brief quality assessment statement and a PRISMA-style flow diagram (or detailed search process paragraph).
3. Correct the minor typographical errors listed above.
4. Clarify how many of the 15 studies are from India and add a summary table of included studies (optional but recommended).

Once these revisions are completed, the manuscript will be suitable for publication. The paper has the potential to inform teacher education, curriculum design, and inclusive education policy in India and beyond