

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96095
Title of the Manuscript:	Early Childhood Care and Education (3-6 Years) and the Role of Traditional Games: An Exploratory Study of Jammu and Kashmir
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? YES, though it could be shortened. (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Yes, this paper is a suitable contribution to the literature. It addresses the importance of games as tools for learning in early childhood.  2. YES, though it could be shortened. 3. The abstract is fine, though references embedded are usually discouraged. 4. I generally prefer the introduction to be given a section number. Indeed, we don't see section numbers until late in the paper. This definitely should be corrected to have standard form. 5. The methodology demonstrates a weakness in the paper, that of qualitatively analysing opinion based sources. This leads one to think "opinion about opinion." Not a preferred scientific approach. There should be better description of the games, at least references or graphical design. A person unfamiliar is challenged to do their own research and look them up. The conclusion section is weak. 6. The references should be numbered – and left-justified. In fact, the structure of this paper is most unusual, and confusing.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is ok.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author seem not to pay attention to standard communication methodology of paper writing.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	G Donald Allen
Department, University & Country	Texas A&M University, USA