

**Paper: “Improving Learning Experience of People with Cognitive Disabilities Using Serious Games: A Review”**

**Submitted: 17 September 2021**

**Accepted: 26 October 2021**

**Published: 31 October 2021**

Corresponding Author: Anirban Chakraborty

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raul Rocha Romero  
Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Olena Kovalchuk  
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Raúl Rocha Romero	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/09/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Improving Learning Experience Of People With Cognitive Disabilities Using Serious Games: A Review</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.10.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The title is very clear.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract is clear. The article is a theoretical-methodological review of the state of the question.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The article is well presented and well structured.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	---
<i>It does not apply because the article is a theoretical review, certainly very well done. In this review they include methodological issues found in the literature.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	---
<i>It does not apply because the article is a theoretical review. This review includes the findings reported in the literature.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are somewhat brief, but refer to the fundamentals of the article</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Check the name of the author listed first in the References.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

*Check the name of the author listed first in the References.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**It is a very good article. It is well presented and well structured. The authors made an exhaustive review on the subject. It presents a review of the state of the art on a very interesting and relevant topic.**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Olena Kovalchuk	
University/Country: Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs	
Date Manuscript Received: 18.09.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 05.10.2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Improving Learning Experience Of People With Cognitive Disabilities Using Serious Games: A Review</b>	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1005/21</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>Improving Learning Experience Of People With Cognitive Disabilities Using Serious Games: A Review</b>	
The title is clear and is adequate to the content of the article	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
As it is a review, the abstract clearly represents the paper objectives	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
The paper is well-written in terms of grammar and vocabulary.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
The purpose of the paper is to make a review of Using Serious Games for Improving Learning Experience Of People With Cognitive Disabilities. The literature analysis on the serious game problem was conducted.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The results are clear, easy to understand, consistent.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. The work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant no. NSF-CCF-1617475.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content and well-structured.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are comprehensive and appropriate. There are 70 references in the paper.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	+
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is well-written, well-structured and clear, there is a scientific novelty in the paper. The term “Serious game” is discussed. I recommend this paper for publication.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

