

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_95189
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovation in Isolation Preschool Children Learn English during Quarantine: Activity-based Crash Course for Parents in EFL Contexts
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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is relevant for the scientific community particularly areas in which the study was conducted. The methodology used is well enough. Style is concise and clear. Study results are clearly stated and respond to the objectives in tandem with the research questions set at the beginning of the work. The conclusions are correct and consistent with the results, while the bibliography is not up to date. Recommendations are vibrant and call for actions too. HOWEVER, Text seems not well ordered. There could not be background to the context and then introduction. Merging the two sections into one could be a remedy. Section 2,3,& could be merged into Literature Review as they are informing the reader about the literature related with the study More importantly, point 5.3(after study significance) could be narrowed in a continuous prose form and be embedded in Literature Review. Point 7 could rather be revisited as findings Possibly the author(s) could reshape the manuscript by merging smaller. Could avoid paragraphs of two or three lines	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriel Bazimaziki
Department, University & Country	University of Rwanda, Rwanda