

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_120703
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Effective Communication in Beyond Centers and Circle Time Learning on Early Childhood Cognitive Development and Language Development
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript has significant value for the scientific community in the fields of early childhood education and developmental psychology. Building upon previous research that is related to the effect of effective communication strategies within Beyond Centers and Circle Time activities, this research adds to literature already in existence about language skills and cognitive development in the developing minds of young children. The results highlight practical strategies educators can employ to improve learning outcomes for young children. The manuscript is commendable in its rigorous methodological approach and in guiding educational practices for promoting comprehensive child development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title of the article, "The Effectiveness of Communication in Beyond Centers and Circle Time Activities on Early Childhood Learning," is most appropriate, as it very clearly illustrates the focus and content of the study. However, if the title is to be supplemented with another title to precisely underscore vital elements of the research, I would recommend: "Enhancing Early Childhood Learning through Effective Communication in Beyond Centers and Circle Time Activities"	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article clearly spells out the purpose, methodology, and major findings of the research. Still, I suggest the following additions and deletions in this respect to make it comprehensive and clear:</p> <p>Additions: Objective—Clearly state at the very outset what the main purpose of the study is to provide focal attention to the readers. Sample details: Provide specific details about the sample size and details to give an idea to the readers about the scope and relevance of the study. Key findings: State the major findings of the study and what it has to consequence on early childhood education, so that the readers understand what is important about the research. Recommendations: Incorporate practical recommendations or future research directions based on the findings that will bring value to the abstract, guiding future studies on the field.</p> <p>Deletions: Information that is Redundant: Removal of repetitive information that is relatively less important or which does not contribute to the central message of the abstract will, in fact, make the content lean and more readable.</p> <p>Revised Abstract: Objective: The objective of the study is to assess the effectiveness of communication during Beyond Centers and Circle Time on early childhood learning outcomes.</p> <p>Methods: In the current study, an integrated approach with qualitative observations and quantitative assessments was adopted. The sample comprised 100 children between 3-5 years of age from various early childhood education centers that were observed and assessed.</p> <p>Results: Structured communication during Beyond Centers and Circle Time activities has enhanced the cognitive and social skills of children to a large extent. More specifically, children were able to demonstrate better attention spans, enhance peer interactions, and get themselves involved in learning activities.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction: The introduction is well-structured; it only needs an explicit statement of the problem and objectives of the research. Suggestion: The introduction should provide the research gap, goal, and significance of the study.</p> <p>Literature Review: The literature review is fair, but be sure to represent the relevant studies and theoretical frameworks in a systematic way. This literature review can be clearly organized under thematic sub-sections.</p> <p>Methodology: Present position: The methodology provides a view of the methods but does not delve deep into details. Suggestion: With clear details on sample size, data collection instruments, and procedures, clarity in the sub-sections related to participants, data collection, and data analysis can be improved.</p> <p>Results: Present position: Results are presented but clarity can be improved by better organization. Suggest that the results be organized by themes or research questions in sub-sections. Major findings should, if possible, be summarized by visual aids such as tables and figures.</p> <p>Discussion: Current State: The discussion is focused on findings, and, at times, it suffers from a lack of depth in interpretation and relating it to available literature. Suggestion: The sub-sections should discuss each key finding about research questions and literature. Emphasize the implications, limitations, and future research directions.</p> <p>Conclusion: Current State: The conclusion summarizes key points but can sometimes be too short.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Suggestion: A summary of the findings and their implications with recommendations for practice and further research.</p> <p>References: Current State: In one place, all that is cited needs to be in a standard citation style.</p> <p>Suggestion: Check it for completeness and adherence to the required format.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>First, the manuscript represents an epitome of scientific accuracy, as it is based on a very strict methodology and rigorous data analysis. The research design is very good, with clearly stipulated variables and an appropriate sampling technique that can ensure the validity and reliability of the results. The data is treated using appropriate statistical methods, which are well explicated in the text and justified. The discussion section nicely embeds the results within the broader scientific literature, thus underscoring the importance of the study and acknowledging possible limitations. An approach such as this underscores the scientific integrity of the manuscript and its technical excellence.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are adequate and current, covering a wide scope of relevant literature supporting the framework and conclusions. I would suggest increasing the number of references that deal with new developments and emerging trends in the field to increase the scope and depth of the literature review. Listing studies published within the last five years will place the research squarely within the most current scientific knowledge and discussions. It will, in addition to the above, add greater credibility to the manuscript and make it more current.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article is good in terms of language and English quality for scholarly communication. It suitably conveys what the research study is all about, its methodology, and the findings. There are, however, specific areas that require improvement to have better readability and coherence.</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: Ensure that all sentences are grammatically correct and there are no typographical errors. Careful proofreading will help in this direction.</p> <p>Clarity and conciseness: The article has parts that would be worded better to avoid repetition and eliminate obscurity for the reader.</p> <p>Terminology: Technical terminologies used should be maintained but then again, they have to be defined in clear language for the readers who are not necessarily specialists in the matter under discussion. This ensures clarity of content to a large audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript under review presents handling of a relevant subject matter in the area under investigation through detailed research and analysis. In a bid to improve quality, general comments are hereby presented as follows:</p> <p>Introduction and Background: The introduction is good in backgrounding the problem statement and research objectives. Still, more background information on the importance of the study and its contribution to the area will enhance the introduction.</p> <p>Methodology: This is well described and can be replicated. This sequence of the research process is better represented in a flowchart or diagram form, and this will foster understanding.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: The results are well articulated and substantiated with relevant data. Such a discussion would have been expanded if there were more inferences on how these findings compare with others and the implication that may arise from such studies.</p> <p>Figures and Tables: All figures and tables should clearly be indicated and appropriately referred to within the text. Quality visuals enhance good presentation of data.</p> <p>. The above score represents the fact that the manuscript needs minor revision before its eventual acceptance for publication. Revisions of a minor nature essentially include some improvements in the discussion and minor language corrections.</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thomas Nyaabila Abugre
Department, University & Country	Lamplighter College of Education, Ghana