

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>
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 manuscript is important for the scientific community because it synthesizes current research on the emerging intersection of AI technology and early childhood education, particularly focusing on language acquisition and literacy development. It addresses a timely topic by exploring the potential of AI-driven storytelling tools, offering insights into how they can revolutionize traditional teaching methods. The emphasis on equitable access, cultural sensitivity, and the specific focus on bilingual settings adds depth to the discussion, which is crucial for creating inclusive educational environments. I appreciate the manuscript's systematic approach and its potential to guide future research, though it could benefit from more practical examples and a deeper exploration of long-term impacts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Systematic Review of AI-Driven Storytelling Applications in Early Childhood Education: Impacts on Language Acquisition and Literacy Development," is clear and descriptive but could be more concise and engaging. A more refined title could be: "AI-Driven Storytelling in Early Childhood Education: A Systematic Review of Impacts on Language Acquisition and Literacy" This alternative retains the key focus while streamlining the wording for clarity and impact.	

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>The abstract is comprehensive, covering the main objectives, key features, and conclusions of the manuscript. It clearly highlights the transformative potential of AI-driven storytelling tools in early childhood education, specifically regarding language acquisition and literacy development. However, a few improvements could enhance clarity and focus:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Refine the Focus:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The abstract could be slightly more concise. Some sentences, particularly those on the general benefits of AI, could be streamlined to avoid repetition.2. Clarify the Geographical Focus:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- While the abstract mentions the focus on bilingual settings and the global reach of AI storytelling, it could more explicitly mention the emphasis on Asia and China, as this is a unique aspect of the manuscript that isn't clear in the abstract.3. Add Research Gaps:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Briefly mention the existing research gaps identified, such as the need for long-term impact studies and research on equitable access, to emphasize areas that require further investigation.4. Specific Outcomes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mention more specific outcomes, such as the improvement in vocabulary, comprehension, and narrative skills, earlier in the abstract, so the reader can immediately grasp the impact of AI tools. <p>Suggested Revised Abstract:</p> <p>This systematic review examines the potential of AI-driven storytelling applications in early childhood education (ECE), particularly for language acquisition and literacy development. By synthesizing existing research, the review identifies key features such as interactivity, personalization, and adaptability, which significantly enrich learning experiences. AI tools, including interactive robots and digital platforms, enhance vocabulary, comprehension, and narrative skills, while promoting cognitive and emotional development. The review also highlights the growing use of AI in bilingual and culturally diverse settings, particularly in Asia and China, and emphasizes the need for equitable access to these tools. Finally, the study identifies gaps in the literature, including a lack of long-term studies, and calls for further research to optimize the integration of AI storytelling in ECE. The findings provide insights for educators, policymakers, and developers to collaboratively harness the potential of AI in education.</p> <p>This revision maintains the original meaning but makes it more concise, highlights specific research gaps, and emphasizes the geographical focus earlier.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow a logical flow that is suitable for a systematic review. It includes all the essential sections, such as the Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Literature Search, Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria, Study Selection, and Data Extraction and Analysis, which are standard in academic reviews.</p> <p>Strengths of the Structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clear Methodological Flow: The use of a systematic review framework ensures that the paper follows a logical sequence, from identifying research questions to selecting and analyzing relevant studies.2. Detailed Methodology: The manuscript does a good job of explaining the steps of the review process, including the databases used, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and data extraction methods. This adds transparency to the research process.3. Well-Defined Research Questions: The research questions provide a clear guide for the	

Review Form 3

	<p>review and help readers understand the focus of the paper.</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 and technically sound due to its adherence to a systematic review methodology, following well-established frameworks like Arksey and O'Malley (2005) and Levac et al. (2010). The use of clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, alongside a detailed literature search strategy involving reputable databases (ERIC, Scopus, IEEE, etc.), ensures that the review is comprehensive and methodologically rigorous. Additionally, the manuscript demonstrates a strong grasp of the subject by synthesizing findings from diverse studies, highlighting both the benefits and limitations of AI storytelling tools in early childhood education. This structured approach ensures transparency, replicability, and reliability of the review's conclusions.</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 cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient, but there are some areas where more recent studies could strengthen the review. Many of the sources referenced seem to be from the past few years, which is important for a rapidly evolving field like artificial intelligence. However, a few more recent references, especially from 2022 or 2023, could be included to ensure that the review captures the latest advancements in AI-driven storytelling and its applications in early childhood education.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include more recent studies (2022-2023): Given the fast pace of AI development, it would be beneficial to incorporate the latest research and technological advancements in AI tools for education. 2. Expand references on bilingual/multicultural education: While the manuscript mentions the importance of cultural sensitivity and bilingual settings, more references that focus specifically on the integration of AI in multicultural or bilingual educational contexts could be added. <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent reviews or meta-analyses of AI in early childhood education from 2022 or 2023. 2. Studies focused on AI applications in under-resourced or rural areas, which would strengthen the manuscript's discussion on equitable access. 3. Research on the long-term impacts of AI storytelling on cognitive and emotional development in young learners, as this is highlighted as a gap in the review. <p>In summary, while the current references are relevant and appropriate, updating and expanding them with the latest studies would enhance the review's scientific rigor.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript uses clear, formal, and precise language appropriate for academic writing. The technical terminology is well-aligned with the subject matter, making it accessible to both educational and AI-focused audiences. However, a few sentences are slightly long or repetitive, which could be streamlined for improved clarity and flow.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Simplify Complex Sentences: Some sentences are lengthy and may benefit from being broken down for better readability and comprehension.2. Avoid Repetition: There are instances of repeating similar ideas, particularly in the abstract and introduction. Condensing these ideas would improve conciseness without losing meaning. <p>Overall, the English quality is adequate for publication, but minor edits to enhance clarity and readability would make the manuscript stronger.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No Comments</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manali Yatish Tambadkar
Department, University & Country	Mumbai University, College of Management and Technology, India