

BPIReviewForm 070520

Book Name:	ScienceandTechnology-RecentUpdatesandFutureProspects
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_BPR_1624
TitleoftheManuscript:	AnEfficientEvaluationofWebAccessibilityforE- LearningwebsitesusingMulti-toolforvisuallychallengedusers
TypeoftheArticle	Book chapter

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Accessibility is a topic of interest to web designers and developers of educational technology tools.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative title in your mind?	The title is okay. The period at the end should be removed.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is adequate. The last lines should be more explicit in terms of web accessibility. The keywords are too much. Some of the keywords are not significant for research purposes e.g. TAW, TENON	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The English is not of the right quality.	



B P International

BPIReviewForm 070520

Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	The websites listed in Table 1 are NOT solely e-learning websites e.g. Google Drive is a storage solution not an e-learning website. The author(s) seem to be unable to identify an e-learning website. In the abstract e-learning websites belong to India was noted. The 7 tools used are okay but the 25 websites used are not all learning websites. This affects the results presented. The results and discussion did not focus on web accessibility for visually impaired people.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The references are not recent - 2017 is the most recent article cited. The number of references used is adequate. There are a number of incomplete references e.g. Rutter, R., Lauke, P. H., Waddell, C., Thatcher, J., Henry, S. L., Lawson, B., & Urban, M. (2007). <i>Web accessibility: Web standards and regulatory compliance</i> . Apress. MM Group. (2015). World Internet Users Statistics and 2015 World Population Stats. World Wide Web Consortium. (2008). Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG) 2.0.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	O. Osunade
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria