

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_124626
Title of the Manuscript:	Language and Literacy Education in Austria – Perspectives of Teachers
Type of the Article	Review 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The idea presented in the following manuscript is vital in developing quality of education. It is important to empower children from early age to effective communication and enhance their learning capabilities. Developing both language the ability to use and understand spoken words or signs and literacy the ability to use and understand written words or other symbols is significant in child fundamental development and social inclusion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes suitable. As the author mostly provide Teachers perspectives. The only suggestion is to add the "Audience" so that the reader could find who is the audience in the following research.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>No additions needed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The severe flaw of the paper are qualitative methods, including online questionnaires and interviews with teachers, which should be the focus of the paper, do not provide very comprehensive data. Nevertheless, the exploratory online questionnaire was administered throughout Australian schools, the results of descriptive analysis did not provide detailed information. When one year later the same questions were conducted as the interview derived from appendix A more detailed information was provided.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust except minor suggestions on including clear and detailed descriptions of the experimental methods used, and their results. It is suggested to provide comprehensive data analysis and potential limitations and biases. Additionally, the literature review is comprehensive, grounding the study in existing research and highlighting its relevance. Overall, the clarity of the experimental design and the replicability of the results contribute to its technical soundness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. Only 14% of the references are ten years before published ones, which do not influence to the sufficientness of the information.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some improvements to the English language within the manuscript have been requested.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Kamola Muradkasimova
Department, University & Country	Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan