

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99666
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF USING THE TALK BOX TO IMPROVE EARLY CHILDREN'S COMMUNICATION ABILITY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This is a simple study with more details required. The problem statement and research gap are to be identified. The data analysis method is simple.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate.</p> <p>More info is to be provided in the abstract, such as the problem statement and more specific findings.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate.</p> <p>Not really. How many lessons using the talkbox, how was the talkbox used to encourage communication skills was not provided. How were the confounding variables controlled?</p> <p>Some of the references provided are a bit dated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, acceptable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Need to re-look at the data analysis method. If quasi-experimental design was employed, is it sufficient to only use mean scores to determine the findings?	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Por Fei Ping
Department, University & Country	School of Education, Wawasan Open University, Malaysia