

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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<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>The paper has the potential to make a meaningful contribution but needs major reworking if it is to fulfill this purpose.</p> <p>The title needs some reworking and I have made a few suggestions in my review on the paper.</p> <p>The abstract is not well written and does not properly indicate the scope of the study or what is being compared. Please see comments on the article. Sub-sections are appropriate but the most important one, namely 'Findings', is not evident meaning that the author does not actually share their findings in any detail which undermines their argument/discussion. No, it is not scientifically correct. The article does not share details of how the study was conducted, how data was analysed, or what was found. No the references are problematic. They are mostly too old and therefore the author is not writing from the perspective of someone who has read current literature on their topic. In addition, there are many references in the reference list that are not actually in the article itself and therefore need to be removed. Lastly, there are statements made in the article that are not referenced at all and need to be.</p> <p>This paper requires substantial reworking before it is publishable. Please look carefully at all the comments made and address them. It is overall rather confusing as it does not show a proper understanding of the theory being used in relation to the topic. It leaves out key information meaning that the argument of the author is undermined. It further assumes information of the reader instead of unpacking issues with sufficient detail.</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 author needed to edit their article properly before submitting it. In addition there is evidence of insufficient use of the author's own words to express what they are trying to say. This is most disappointing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Giulietta Harrison
Department, University & Country	Rhodes University, South Africa