



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_8674
Title of the Manuscript:	A Four Country Comparison: Special Education in the United States, China, India and Thailand
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Specifically, the study was conducted in two elementary schools in each country. Even if the author had attempted to show that the schools were representative of each country, it is highly implausible that generalizations can be made for such vast populations as China and India based on data from 2 schools. For comparisons, the author needs to draw on available statistics from each of the country's Ministries of Education or other governmental bodies delegated with the task of collecting data on the three areas specified in this study: class size, staffing, and staff qualifications. Another alternative for this paper, is to limit it to a discussion paper regarding differences in educational resources and in laws pertaining to Special Education.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Country comparisons cannot be made based on findings from two schools.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer