

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_124176
Title of the Manuscript:	Bilinguality: An Illusive Concept
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This opinion article is, in my perspective a very bold and relevant one with regards to language research and practice. It may aid in the elimination of various confounding factors and bias occurring in researches being done among bilinguals. It may also emphasize the need for creating assessment tools grading the 'bilinguality' of a person, which in turn will have positive implications in research and practise.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Instead of stating that "bilinguality is illusive", it may be better if the title is framed as a question so that it is open for the readers' interpretation rather than forcing the opinion. Suggestion: "Is bilingualism a myth?" or any other on these grounds.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. Although, mentioning a considerable amount of content regarding 'monolinguals' and the comparison between bilinguals and monolinguals in the abstract is giving the idea that the article is about 'both monolinguals and bilinguals & comparing the characteristics of both these groups'. Suggestion: alteration with respect the above mentioned, making the abstract more prone towards the concept of 'bilingualism'	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the article is in a logical sequence. Although, there can be a few more secondary titles within some sections such as the one which consists information regarding different groups of bilinguals (early, sequential and late), for example. This will aid the reader to clearly be able to distinct the categories.	
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.	The article is technically sound with regards to language concepts and research. But the reviewer is not able to comment on the article being 'scientifically robust' as it does not consist of any statistics nor a systematic methodology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. A considerable number of references are within the last 10 years. No additional suggestions.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality can be better in order to suite scholarly communication. The use of 'first person's point of view' can be avoided and replaced with the 'third person's point of view' in order to make the language more formal. Also, there are use of certain strong words such as 'should' which may be replaced with 'may' or 'can'.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The "background" of the article poses a few questions in the first paragraph. The author can attempt to answer the same in the "conclusion" part of the article. • There is a repetition in "new methods of assessment", 2nd paragraph, 5th line – "daily usage" • A few major concepts (words) such as age, order of acquisition etc are often repeated. • The author talks about guidelines and questionnaires that can be used. The same may be cited and mentioned so that future researches can employ the same (if available). • In future recommendations, the factors are referred to as "potential pitfalls" which can rather be mentioned as "potential challenges" • In addition to the 'future recommendations', a section can be added with regards to the 'future directions' mentioning the future efforts of the author to face the "potential challenges" addressed in the article 	

Review Form 3

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:	Jenita Caren Rajakumari J
Department, University & Country	Institute of Salutogenesis and Complementary Medicine, Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth University, India