



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_14946
Title of the Manuscript:	College Students with Disabilities: How Faculty Can Increase the Opportunities for Student Success.
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	1. In second paragraph, "The problem is faculty aren't always prepared...". There are so many grammar mistakes in this paper. Reviewer suggest that author should ask native speaker to proofread his paper. 2. No data support the finding of this paper. 3. No research method is in this paper. 4. Reviewer don't know how author use three strategies in experiment.	I have attempted to make the grammatical corrections and have included a method section. 1. In second paragraph, "The problem is faculty aren't always prepared...". Please see Line 31 for the revised statement. 2. The paper is a review of three learning strategies. 3. A method section is included: please see lines 138-161 4. The three strategies emerged from a Review and Content Analysis to determine which strategies faculty could include in their teaching as recommended by college students with disabilities. Strategies had to meet the criteria of being (a) inexpensive (b) easy to use and (c) proven successful for students with disabilities.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should follow the format of academic paper. For example, the first section is introduction, the second section is literature review and so on.	I have revised the format based on the reviewer's feedback to the extent possible as indicated as follows: • Line 14: Introduction • Line 42: Literature Review • Line 138: Method • Line 266 Implications for Teachers • Line 303: Discussion and Conclusion • Line 334: References



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. I believe the changes have substantially improved the article since the initial submission and I hope it is worthy of being published in the British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science
---	--	--