

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_124667
Title of the Manuscript:	Systematic Review of AI-Driven Storytelling Applications in Early Childhood Education: Impacts on Language Acquisition and Literacy Development
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

[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>This systematic review contributes significantly to the scientific world by synthesizing cutting-edge research on AI-driven storytelling applications in early childhood education, informing evidence-based practices and policy decisions. The review addresses the knowledge gap in this emerging field, providing insights into effective design principles, outcomes, and future research directions. By integrating findings from diverse disciplines, this study fosters interdisciplinary collaboration and innovation, advancing our understanding of AI's potential in education. Ultimately, this review has the potential to impact educational outcomes, informing the development of AI-powered educational tools that enhance language development and literacy skills in young children.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title "Systematic Review of AI-Driven Storytelling Applications in Early Childhood" suitable and effectively communicates the focus and purpose. Here's why:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly states the topic: AI-driven storytelling applications. Specifies the context: Early childhood. Indicates the research methodology: Systematic review. <p>Self-explanatory motive</p> <p>The title implies that the review aims to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate the existing literature on AI-driven storytelling applications. Analysed their effectiveness, impact, or potential in early childhood education. Age range included in the inclusion criteria <p>Although it seems to have not provided a comprehensive overview of the current state of research in this area.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Consider adding specific details to further clarify the scope and focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Age range: Specify the age range for early childhood (e.g., 0-5, 0-8). Outcome measures: Indicate the type of outcomes or effects being examined (e.g., language development, literacy, cognitive skills). Application types: Clarify the types of storytelling applications being reviewed (e.g., interactive, virtual, augmented reality). 	

Review Form 3

<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>It is alright because the article has stated the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefly introduced the research context and significance. - Provide background information on the topic. 2. Research Problem <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly stated the research problem or question in form of an objective 3. Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Described the research design, methods, and procedures. - Mentioned any specific tools, technologies, or software used. 4. Main Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summarized the key results, discoveries, or insights. - Highlighted any significant trends, patterns, or relationships. 5. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interpreted the implications of the findings. - Suggested potential applications, future research directions, and recommendations 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure seems to be correct.</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>Yes, the reviewer can see some methodological rigour in this article. Because the article has the following key components: 1. Clear research question and objectives stated; 2. Comprehensive literature search strategy (use of end note); 3. Well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria; 4. Some form of transparent reporting of methods and results. Although the use of Standardized data extraction and quality assessment is questionable. My suggestion is that the editor should advice the author to adhere to the following criteria:</p> <p>Systematic Review-Specific Rigor Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protocol registration and adherence 2. Systematic search strategy (such as., PRISMA) 3. Study selection and screening (such as., dual screening) 4. Data extraction and quality assessment (such as., Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool) 5. Synthesis and analysis (such as., meta-analysis, narrative synthesis) <p>And author may be encouraged to use such tools:</p> <p>Assesment Tools</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses); 2. AMSTAR (Assessment of Multiple Systematic Reviews); 3. Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool; and 4. ROBINS-I (Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions) <p>And should consider registering the Protocol before administration or use already registered protocols</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>to enhance rigour. In order to enhance rigour, the author should :1. Register protocol on PROSPERO or similar databases, 2. Use systematic search strategies and report according to PRISMA, 3. Employ dual screening and data extraction., 4. Conduct quality assessment using standardized tools and 5. Perform meta-analysis or narrative synthesis.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some references are out-dated.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is clear and concise</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The reviewer is wondering whether it was necessary to provide informed consent to participants in a systematic review. Because participants refer to the studies, papers, or documents that meet the pre-defined inclusion criteria and are included in the review.</p> <p>Participants in Systematic Reviews:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary research studies (e.g., randomized controlled trials, observational studies) 2. Secondary research studies (e.g., systematic reviews, meta-analyses) 3. Grey literature (e.g., conference proceedings, technical reports) 4. Published and unpublished studies <p>Eligibility Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Study design (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental) 2. Population (e.g., age, diagnosis) 3. Intervention or exposure (e.g., treatment, program) 4. Outcome measures (e.g., language development, literacy skills) 5. Language and publication date <p>Participant Selection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Literature search: Identify potential studies through databases, search engines, and hand-searching. 2. Screening: Review titles, abstracts, and full texts to determine eligibility. 3. Inclusion: Select studies that meet the pre-defined eligibility criteria. <p>Example of Participant Selection: For a systematic review on "AI-driven storytelling applications in early childhood education":</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary research studies (such as., randomized controlled trials, case studies) - Published in English - Focused on AI-driven storytelling in early childhood education (ages 0-8) - Reported outcomes on language development, literacy skills, or cognitive development <p>My advice to the author is that, in a systematic review, informed consent is typically not required from the participants (thus., studies, papers, or documents) because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No direct human participation: Systematic reviews involve analyzing existing literature, not interacting with human subjects. 2. No personal identifiable information: Studies are typically aggregated and anonymized, making it impossible to identify individual participants. 3. No risk or harm: Systematic reviews do not pose any risk or harm to individuals or groups. <p>However, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copyright and permissions: Ensure you have the necessary permissions or licenses to use copyrighted materials, such as figures or tables. 2. Data sharing and reuse: Verify the terms of use for datasets or studies included in the review. 	

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:	Getrude Chimfwembe
Department, University & Country	Chalimbana University, Zambia