

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_115679
Title of the Manuscript:	Early Childhood Education and Language Policy Dynamics Examined through Basil Bernstein's Lens
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript is a very important one on a basis that the researcher improves on the comments.</p> <p>The title of the article is correct.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but missing the research design, the research instruments and the implication of the study.</p> <p>The subsections of the article are not very comprehensive. Even the recommendations should suggest the stakeholder responsible for the actions. The discussion section is lacking the rigour and the work is not backed up with the literature supporting or disagreeing with the findings. Even some of the references are too old to be used in the article. The article does not seem to present the findings. Let the researcher include the findings in the paper.</p> <p>The references are appropriate but some are too old and they are very few in the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language used in the article is appropriate although a lot of editing is needed throughout the article. Let the researcher check on the spellings and the grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Include the emerging themes and the data in the findings. The manuscript can not have only two themes in the whole paper.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Apolot Josephine Matha
Department, University & Country	Kyambogo University, Uganda