

Evidence Patterns in Pediatric Intervention Research: An Integrative Review

Milind Deshkar¹, Nirmohi Patole², Jatin Bhaduri³, Divya Bhosale⁴, and Komal Hande⁵

¹HOD & Guide, Department of Master's of Computer Applications, ASM's IBMR, Chinchwad, Maharashtra, India

^{2,3,4,5}Student, Department of Master's of Computer Applications, ASM's IBMR, Chinchwad, Maharashtra, India

Abstract— This integrative review synthesizes evidence from fifteen scholarly sources on pediatric assessment, intervention, engagement, and measurement research. The selected studies span reading and literacy difficulty, binocular vision and reading, written expression, attention-related cognitive training, socio-emotional coping, early intervention, movement-skill training, everyday functioning in Down syndrome, autism-related recognition and communication tools, and pediatric vision-treatment adherence. Across these heterogeneous studies, structured and sufficiently intensive support is associated with more consistent gains in the specific outcome being trained, while engagement-oriented and game-based formats can improve participation without reliably demonstrating transfer to broader real-world functioning. Executive-function measures recur across otherwise distinct study populations, although the reviewed evidence does not establish a common causal mechanism. Recognition technologies such as eye-tracking and facial-expression classification show measurement potential but remain sensitive to calibration, sample diversity, training-data composition, and context of use. The review concludes that small samples, short follow-up periods, heterogeneous outcome measures, and uneven external validation limit the strength of cross-study conclusions, and it outlines reporting priorities intended to make future evidence easier to compare.

Keywords— evidence synthesis, outcome measurement, intervention research, transfer, generalization, engagement, executive function, recognition technology, accessibility, pediatric research.

I. INTRODUCTION

Children with different learning and developmental conditions are studied in separate research streams, yet they raise comparable methodological questions. Studies target academic skills, motor performance, attention, communication, socio-emotional coping, treatment adherence, or everyday functioning using instructional, therapeutic, technological, or mixed approaches. Comparison is difficult because populations, outcomes, intervention doses, and study designs differ; synthesis must therefore distinguish measured outcomes from broader claims about functioning or effectiveness.

This review brings together fifteen sources across two broad groupings: learning-related outcomes, and developmental, neurodevelopmental, technology, or treatment questions. Six sources address reading, literacy, written expression, dyslexia assessment, binocular vision, and socio-emotional coping; nine address Down syndrome, autism spectrum disorder, ADHD, pediatric amblyopia, treatment adherence, or cross-cutting technology and equity. The grouping organizes comparison and does not imply clinical equivalence.

Four recurring evidence questions structure the review: what outcome is demonstrated; whether improvement extends beyond the trained task; how long effects are sustained; and how confidently a measurement or classification approach generalizes beyond its development sample.

Accessibility, representativeness, and the distinction between prototype performance and demonstrated real-world benefit are additional considerations.

This paper does not introduce a new intervention or evaluate a particular software product. It compares the fifteen selected studies on outcomes, engagement, cognitive measures, measurement technologies, accessibility, transfer, and research limitations, while considering how study design affects the strength of findings.

II. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

An integrative narrative-review method was used. Fifteen previously published scholarly sources were examined for objectives, populations, intervention or assessment approach, methodology, principal findings, outcome measures, and limitations. The sources include systematic, scoping, narrative, and conceptual reviews; a retrospective clinical study; mixed-methods and feasibility research; and applied technology-development reports, covering academic, sensory, cognitive, socio-emotional, motor, communication, adherence, and measurement questions.

The fifteen sources were selected because each contributes a distinct population, outcome domain, intervention type, or methodological perspective relevant to the review's comparison framework. They were selected for comparative coverage rather than through a new systematic database search and are not claimed to represent the complete literature on the populations or technologies discussed.

Findings were organized by broad study population and cross-cutting themes: targeted outcomes, engagement and socio-emotional support, cognitive measures, measurement and recognition technology, accessibility, transfer, duration, and methodological limitation. The synthesis is qualitative because the sources do not share a common population, comparator, intervention, or outcome metric suitable for pooled analysis.

This manuscript is not an independent systematic review or meta-analysis. No new database search, duplicate screening, formal risk-of-bias assessment, or pooled statistical analysis was conducted. Conclusions are bounded by the fifteen selected sources and the quality and completeness of their reporting.

II-A. Rationale for a Cross-Study Evidence Comparison

The selected studies differ in diagnosis, age range, intervention type, and outcome definition, so comparison is not intended to imply clinical equivalence. Instead, it highlights methodological patterns, such as the difference between improvement on a trained task and broader functional change, or between technical classification accuracy and usefulness in everyday settings. This cross-study perspective is the review's principal organizing rationale.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE SELECTED SOURCES

Table I lists the six sources concerned primarily with learning-related outcomes, and Table II lists the nine sources concerned with developmental, neurodevelopmental, treatment, technology, or equity questions.

Table I. Learning-Disability Sources

Source	Focus	Method
Al Otaiba et al. [1]	Reading difficulty, dyslexia	Synthesis of 14 reviews
Marinelli et al. [2]	Literacy, learning disability	Systematic review; 6 studies
Ayaz et al. [3]	Dysgraphia, written expression	Scoping review; 47 articles
Toki [9]	Dyslexia assessment	Systematic review; 21 studies
Sengupta [11]	Binocular vision, reading, SLD	Comprehensive literature review
Praveen Kumar & Phyllis [12]	Emotional coping, learning disability	Conceptual / narrative article

Table II. Developmental, Neurodevelopmental, Treatment, and Cross-Cutting Sources

Luo et al. [8]	ADHD, cognitive/behavioural training	Feasibility study; n=110
Source	Focus	Method
Piatti et al. [4]	Down syndrome, early intervention	Retrospective study; 20 children
Qin et al. [5]	Autism spectrum disorder	Narrative review
Yudhistira et al. [6]	Down syndrome, movement skills	Scoping review; 12 studies
Pereira et al. [13]	Down syndrome, adaptive behaviour	Systematic review; 8 studies
SenthilPrabhu et al. [14]	Autism, object/sign recognition	Applied system development
Patel et al. [15]	Autism, facial expression	CNN model; existing facial-expression dataset
Liu et al. [7]	Paediatric amblyopia, adherence	Mixed-methods study + RCT
Umucu [10]	Disability-inclusive technology	Conceptual framework

IV. EVIDENCE PATTERNS IN LEARNING-RELATED STUDIES

IV-A. Reading, Literacy, and Vision-Related Difficulty

Al Otaiba et al. synthesized fourteen meta-analyses and systematic reviews of literacy intervention for elementary students with reading difficulties and dyslexia [1]. Effects depended on instructional component, delivery arrangement, intensity, duration, implementer, and outcome domain, with foundational outcomes such as decoding distinguished from higher-order outcomes such as comprehension.

Marinelli et al. examined six controlled studies of serious games for literacy in children with learning disabilities (249 children) and reported selected reading and metaphonological gains with motivational benefits, but limited evidence of transfer to untreated literacy skills [2].

Sengupta's review adds a sensory dimension to the reading-difficulty literature that the original ten-source synthesis did not cover: the relationship between binocular vision, accommodation, and reading performance in children with specific learning disability (SLD) [11]. Drawing on prior prevalence research, the review reports that approximately eighty percent of children with a learning disability show accommodation or vergence abnormalities, most commonly convergence insufficiency and accommodative infacility, and that these abnormalities are associated with reduced reading speed, accuracy, and efficiency [11]. The review further reports that vision therapy targeting convergence and accommodation is associated with improvement in near point of convergence, fusional vergence ranges, and accommodative facility, alongside reductions in parent-reported academic-behaviour symptoms, although office-based accommodative and vergence therapy alone did not significantly improve reading outcomes in one sixteen-week randomized trial it discusses [11]. Toki's systematic review of twenty-one studies complements this vision-based evidence from a measurement perspective, identifying fixation duration, saccadic patterns, regressions, and processing speed as eye-movement indicators associated with dyslexia, while cautioning that language, task design, attention, fatigue, and calibration can all influence these signals [9].

Read together, these sources indicate that reading difficulty in children with learning disability has linguistic-instructional and oculomotor-sensory dimensions, addressed respectively by literacy intervention and binocular-vision assessment or therapy [1], [2], [11]. Neither dimension appears sufficient alone: Sengupta recommends binocular vision assessment as part of screening for children with SLD [11], while literacy research cautions against treating a single instructional gain as evidence of general reading improvement [1].

IV-B. Written Expression and Attention-Related Difficulty

Ayaz et al. mapped interventions for dysgraphia and specific learning disorder in written expression across forty-seven articles, covering educational, technological, therapeutic, psychological, and multisensory approaches [3]. Because written expression involves distinct processes such as transcription and composition, the review supports precise outcome definitions when comparing interventions. Luo et al. examined a mobile serious-game prototype in fifty-five children with ADHD and fifty-five typically developing peers, reporting improvements in selected attention, inhibitory-control, and working-memory measures after four weeks, while noting that the pre-post design limits causal interpretation of longer-term effectiveness [8].

Both studies point to the importance of executive-function skills, especially working memory and inhibitory control, in written-expression and attention-related difficulties. A similar pattern appears later in the review, where executive-function measures are linked with adaptive behaviour in children with Down syndrome [13].

IV-C. Socio-Emotional Dimensions of Learning Disability

Praveen Kumar and Phyllis examine emotional intelligence as a coping resource for students with learning disabilities, arguing that repeated experiences of academic failure can contribute to frustration, anxiety, lowered self-esteem, and withdrawal, and that these emotional responses can, in turn, interfere with a child's engagement in instruction [12]. The paper frames emotional intelligence around five components adapted from Goleman's

model, namely self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill, and discusses the seven-part "ELEVATE" classroom framework as one example of how these components can be built into everyday teaching practice rather than treated as a separate emotional-support program [12].

This source broadens learning-disability outcomes beyond decoding, spelling, or writing accuracy. If frustration and low self-esteem interfere with attempts at reading or writing, socio-emotional coping may support literacy and written-expression gains. None of the instructional or vision-based sources directly measured emotional coping, which is identified later as a research gap.

V. EVIDENCE PATTERNS IN DEVELOPMENTAL AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES

V-A. Down Syndrome: Early Intervention, Movement, and Adaptive Behaviour

Piatti et al. reported a retrospective study of twenty children with Down syndrome, finding higher mean developmental and cognitive scores at age five among children who had received structured multidisciplinary early intervention compared with a conventional-care group, while noting that the non-randomized design and small sample limit causal certainty [4]. Yudhistira et al. reviewed twelve studies of game-based interventions for fundamental movement skills in Down syndrome, identifying structured play, adapted sports, exergames, and serious games as distinct intervention models associated with reported gains in balance, locomotor ability, coordination, and visual-motor integration, alongside variation in duration, intensity, and supervision across studies [6].

Pereira et al. extend the Down syndrome evidence base with a 2026 systematic review of eight studies on cognitive predictors of adaptive behaviour, registered with PROSPERO and conducted according to PRISMA guidance [13]. Executive functions, particularly working memory and inhibitory control, recurred as predictors across communication, daily-living, and socialisation domains; flexibility and planning were less consistent [13]. Visual-perceptual and visuomotor skills, verbal and nonverbal cognition, and attention also correlated with adaptive behaviour, though less consistently. Most underlying studies were cross-sectional and relied on parent- or caregiver-report measures, which may not capture functioning across settings [13].

Together, these sources suggest a developmental sequence for future Down syndrome research: structured multidisciplinary intervention is associated with broad developmental gains [4]; game-based movement intervention with specific motor and coordination gains [6]; and executive-function strength with adaptive everyday functioning [13]. This is an interpretive frame, not a tested causal model, because no study followed the same children across all three stages.

V-B. Autism Spectrum Disorder: Recognition and Communication-Support Tools

Qin et al. reviewed recent developments in the diagnosis and treatment of autism spectrum disorder, describing the condition's clinical heterogeneity and the need to interpret any single intervention or assessment approach within a broader clinical context [5]. SenthilPrabhu et al. describe an applied, gamified web-based learning system intended to support children with autism spectrum disorder in object recognition, item naming through text-to-

speech feedback, and sign-language learning through a paired letter-and-gesture flashcard interface [14]. Patel et al. describe a convolutional neural network for facial-expression recognition intended as an educational aid for children with autism spectrum disorder; the study reports 72% accuracy and describes recognition of seven expression groups using static and real-time data [15].

Both applied systems are described as prototypes or early-stage tools rather than validated clinical interventions. Neither reports a controlled evaluation of whether system use changes object-recognition, communication, or emotion-recognition ability outside the application itself [14], [15]. The distinction between a working prototype and demonstrated educational benefit is therefore important throughout this review.

VI. CROSS-CUTTING CONSIDERATIONS: TREATMENT ADHERENCE AND EQUITABLE DESIGN

Two further sources do not belong exclusively to either cluster but inform both. Liu et al. conducted a mixed-methods evaluation, including a randomized comparison, of a gamified mobile application intended to improve treatment adherence in children aged seven to ten with amblyopia, reporting higher short-term adherence for the gamified condition over a four-week period, with the observed advantage concentrated in adherence rather than in a direct measure of visual function [7]. Considered alongside the vision-therapy evidence in Section IV-A, this source illustrates that gamified design can support consistent engagement with a prescribed vision-related regimen, though adherence and functional visual improvement remain distinct outcomes that should be reported separately [7], [11].

Umucu proposes disability-inclusive technology design centered on accessibility, autonomy, participation, and equity alongside technical performance, with direct involvement of people with disabilities in requirements-gathering and evaluation [10]. Applied to the recognition tools in Section V-B, this means classification accuracy is informative but incomplete: tools also need evaluation of whether children with autism spectrum disorder and their families can access, understand, and meaningfully use them in everyday settings [10], [14], [15].

VII. SHARED COGNITIVE AND METHODOLOGICAL THREADS

Executive-function measures recur across studies of academic, attention-related, and everyday-function outcomes. Luo et al. targeted attention, inhibitory control, and working memory in ADHD [8], Pereira et al. examined executive-function measures as predictors of adaptive behaviour in Down syndrome [13], and Ayaz et al. identified planning and self-regulation within some written-expression interventions [3]. This supports comparison of executive-function measurement, but does not establish a shared cause or mechanism across diagnoses.

The convergence is therefore a methodological opportunity rather than a clinical-equivalence claim. The studies were not designed to test whether dysgraphia, ADHD, and Down syndrome share an underlying mechanism. Future comparative work could report executive-function measures alongside primary outcomes when

theoretically justified, helping examine whether cognitive measures explain variation in intervention response or everyday functioning.

VIII. ENGAGEMENT, SOCIO-EMOTIONAL SUPPORT, AND PARTICIPATION

Interactive and emotionally supportive design is repeatedly associated with participation. Marinelli et al. reported motivational benefits and selected literacy improvements with serious games while broader generalisation remained uncertain [2]. Praveen Kumar and Phyllis discuss emotional-intelligence skills as a coping resource [12]; Yudhistira et al. report participation-related findings in game-based movement interventions [6]; and SenthilPrabhu et al. describe reward-based feedback intended to sustain practice [14].

Liu et al. reported higher short-term adherence in a gamified amblyopia intervention [7], while Luo et al. reported changes in selected cognitive and behavioural measures after four weeks of mobile-game use [8]. Together, these sources indicate that engagement, adherence, and socio-emotional factors can be measured as outcomes. None establishes that engaging or emotionally supportive design alone produces durable or broadly transferable skill improvement.

IX. MEASUREMENT AND RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGIES

Toki's systematic review identified fixation duration, saccadic patterns, regressions, and processing speed as informative eye-tracking measures in dyslexia, while noting that language, task design, attention, fatigue, and calibration can influence them [9]. Patel et al.'s facial-expression model reported 72% accuracy across seven expression groups using static and real-time data [15]. SenthilPrabhu et al.'s system incorporates object and sign-language recognition into a learning interface [14].

Umucu's framework adds an equity perspective, emphasizing accessibility, participation, autonomy, and transparent reporting of intended use and limitations alongside technical accuracy [10]. Together, the evidence supports treating computational measurement and recognition tools as complementary sources whose uncertainty, training-data composition, and context of use must be reported. Accuracy in a research sample does not by itself establish readiness for unsupervised classroom or clinical use [9], [10], [14], [15].

X. TRANSFER, DURATION, AND GENERALIZATION

A clear cross-cutting limitation is the distance between improvement on a trained task and broader real-world functioning. Literacy research recommends transfer tasks, authentic work samples, and delayed follow-up to test whether gains extend beyond training [1], [2]. Sengupta likewise distinguishes changes in binocular-vision measures from academic outcomes, including a sixteen-week randomized trial in which office-based vergence and accommodative therapy did not significantly improve reading outcomes [11].

Pereira et al. note that most included studies were cross-sectional, leaving unclear whether executive-function deficits precede later adaptive-behaviour differences or simply co-occur with them; they call for longitudinal designs from early childhood through adolescence [13]. Digital-health and applied-technology studies also used

short windows: Liu et al. and Luo et al. ran for four weeks, while SenthilPrabhu et al. and Patel et al. report no field evaluation beyond initial system testing [7], [8], [14], [15].

XI. ACCESSIBILITY AND EQUITY ACROSS BOTH POPULATIONS

Umucu's framework identifies inaccessible hardware, cost, limited language support, and assumptions about communication style as potential inequities, and recommends participation by people with disabilities in requirements-gathering and evaluation [10].

These issues also affect external validity: a technically accurate system may not be equally usable or meaningful across devices, languages, settings, or user groups.

Setting-specific issues also matter. Toki notes that glasses, lighting, and calibration tolerance can affect eye-tracking [9]. Pereira et al. observe that parent- or caregiver-report instruments may not capture adaptive behaviour across every setting [13].

Praveen Kumar and Phyllis note that inclusive classroom practice depends on educators recognizing and responding to a child's emotional state, not only on the child's coping skill [12]. Accessibility and representativeness should therefore be treated as aspects of study validity, not optional considerations.

XII. RESEARCH GAPS

- a. Across both clusters, evidence is limited by small samples, short intervention windows, or single-site populations [1]–[3], [7], [8], [13].
- b. No source reviewed here jointly measures socio-emotional coping and academic-skill outcomes for children with learning disability; emotional-intelligence evidence and literacy/vision-therapy evidence remain in separate studies [11], [12].
- c. Longitudinal designs that track executive function and adaptive behaviour together over time, rather than cross-sectionally, are needed in Down syndrome research [13].
- d. Neither applied autism-support tool reviewed here reports a controlled evaluation of real-world educational or communicative benefit beyond system-level testing [14], [15].
- e. Eye-tracking and facial-expression recognition approaches require larger and more diverse validation samples, explicit reporting of calibration and class-balance issues, and clear separation between screening, assessment, and everyday classroom use [9], [15].
- f. Future studies should distinguish participant characteristics and test findings across languages, cultures, and educational settings for both learning-disability and developmental-disability populations [1], [3], [9].
- g. Accessibility, affordability, and participation should be reported as study outcomes or implementation variables where they materially affect validity or uptake [10], [14], [15].
– Comparative studies should distinguish prototype feasibility, adherence, task-level learning, and broader functional outcomes rather than treating them as interchangeable indicators of success.

XIII. LIMITATIONS OF THIS INTEGRATIVE REVIEW

This review is limited by its reliance on fifteen previously selected sources rather than an independent systematic search. The sources range from a retrospective clinical study to systematic reviews and applied technology-development reports, so findings cannot be pooled into a single quantitative effect estimate; apparent convergence reflects qualitative comparison.

The review also did not independently retrieve, screen, or quality-appraise primary studies beyond what the fifteen source papers reported. Findings specific to one population, age range, or setting should not automatically be generalized elsewhere. The paper is therefore an integrative synthesis of reported evidence and limitations rather than new empirical evidence.

CONCLUSION

Across the fifteen sources, structured and sufficiently intensive support is associated with more consistent gains in the specific outcome targeted, but heterogeneous designs prevent a single conclusion about effectiveness across populations and interventions.

Engagement-oriented and game-based formats can support participation or adherence, yet the evidence does not establish that engagement alone produces broad or lasting real-world transfer. Executive-function measures recur across attention, academic, and everyday-function studies, but do not establish a universal causal mechanism.

Recognition and measurement technologies, including eye-tracking and facial-expression classification, show potential as complementary tools but require careful validation, transparent reporting of training-data composition, and realistic framing of their development stage.

The most consistent methodological priorities are longer follow-up, clearly defined primary outcomes, explicit transfer measures, diverse validation samples, and transparent reporting of accessibility and limitations.

PRACTICAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST

For future studies in either cluster, the following reporting elements can make evidence easier to interpret and compare.

Element	Minimum reporting expectation
Research design	State whether randomized, quasi-experimental, feasibility, observational, review, or conceptual.
Participants	Report sample size, age range, diagnostic criteria, and recruitment setting.
Intervention exposure	Report duration, session frequency, dose, supervision, and adherence.
Primary outcome	Predefine the main outcome using a measure suited to the target skill or behaviour.
Cognitive/emotional measures	Where relevant, report executive-function and socio-emotional measures alongside the primary outcome.

Transfer / follow-up	Include delayed or real-world measures when claims extend beyond immediate task performance.
Recognition/AI tools	Report training-data composition, validation population, and known error patterns.
Accessibility	Report device, setting, language, and participation by the population studied.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Al Otaiba, K. McMaster, J. Wanzek, and M. W. Zaru, "What We Know and Need to Know about Literacy Interventions for Elementary Students with Reading Difficulties and Disabilities, Including Dyslexia," *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 313–332, 2023, doi: 10.1002/rrq.458.
- [2] C. V. Marinelli, G. Nardacchione, E. Trotta, R. Di Fuccio, P. Palladino, L. Traetta, and P. Limone, "The Effectiveness of Serious Games for Enhancing Literacy Skills in Children with Learning Disabilities or Difficulties: A Systematic Review," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 7, Art. no. 4512, 2023, doi: 10.3390/app13074512.
- [3] M. Ayaz, S. Parwez, M. A. Paracha, S. A. Jalil, U. Safi, and S. Amin, "Existing Interventions for the Management of Different Types of Dysgraphia or Specific Learning Disorder in Written Expression: A Scoping Review," *BMJ Open*, vol. 16, e113327, 2026, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2025-113327.
- [4] A. E. Piatti, B. Stefani, G. Bini, and S. Bargagna, "Multidisciplinary early intervention in Down syndrome: a retrospective study," *Minerva Pediatr.*, 2022, doi: 10.23736/S2724-5276.22.06797-0.
- [5] L. Qin, H. Wang, W. Ning, M. Cui, and Q. Wang, "New advances in the diagnosis and treatment of autism spectrum disorders," *European Journal of Medical Research*, vol. 29, Art. no. 322, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s40001-024-01916-2.
- [6] D. Yudhistira et al., "The Role of Game-Based Interventions in Developing Fundamental Movement Skills in Down Syndrome," *Balneo and PRM Research Journal*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2026, doi: 10.12680/balneo.2026.1028.
- [7] B. Liu, Y. Fan, M. Xu, F. Chang, Y. Shi, and Z. Liu, "Effectiveness of a Gamified Mobile App in Enhancing Treatment Adherence for Children With Amblyopia: Explorative Study," *JMIR Serious Games*, vol. 13, e60309, 2025, doi: 10.2196/60309.
- [8] J. Luo, F. Li, Y. Wu, X. Liu, Q. Zheng, Y. Qi, H. Huang, G. Xu, Z. Liu, F. He, and Y. Zheng, "A Mobile Device-Based Game Prototype for ADHD: Development and Preliminary Feasibility Testing," *Translational Psychiatry*, vol. 14, Art. no. 251, 2024, doi: 10.1038/s41398-024-02964-2.
- [9] E. I. Toki, "Using Eye-Tracking to Assess Dyslexia: A Systematic Review of Emerging Evidence," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 11, Art. no. 1256, 2024, doi: 10.3390/educsci14111256.
- [10] E. Umucu, "Artificial Intelligence and Health Equity for People with Disabilities: An Integrated Framework for Disability-Inclusive AI Design," *Inquiry*, vol. 62, Art. no. 469580251365472, 2025, doi: 10.1177/00469580251365472.

- [11] R. Sengupta, "Insight into the Impact of Vision Therapy on Academic Performance of Children with Learning Disabilities and Binocular Vision Anomalies: A Comprehensive Review," *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 43–54, 2023.
- [12] S. Praveen Kumar and J. Prija Phyllis, "Emotional Intelligence as a Coping Strategy for Students with Learning Disabilities," *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR)*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 204–212, 2021.
- [13] F. S. Pereira, R. M. S. Santos, L. H. Souza Junior, N. H. F. F. de Carvalho, C. de P. Gomes, A. M. Ferreira, M. A. Romano-Silva, L. F. Malloy-Diniz, and D. M. de Miranda, "Cognitive Predictors of Adaptive Behaviour in Children With Down Syndrome: A Systematic Review," *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, vol. 39, no. 1, Art. no. e70201, 2026, doi: 10.1111/jar.70201.
- [14] N. SenthilPrabhu, D. Dharanish, S. Kodeshwaran, G. Varshini, and T. S. Vijayasuriyan, "Gamified Learning Web Application for Person with Disabilities," *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR)*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 8–14, 2024.
- [15] H. Patel, P. Bhondave, S. Gawali, R. Lambole, and H. Ambore, "Deep Learning Facial Expression Recognition for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder," *International Journal for Scientific Research & Development*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 124–126, 2022.

