



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30744
Title of the Manuscript:	ICTs and Early Literacy: spontaneous insertions of preschoolers during reading, e-book vs traditional book
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Although the paper is well-organised, my some concern is that the rationale of the study is not well documented. Similarly, the reported results seem to corroborate previous findings and not to enrich the existing literature. 2. Abstract: The authors should provide more information of the methodology adopted. Moreover, the final sentence "the combined use of e-book with the traditional book....." seems not to be supported by the data. 3. Introduction: The terms "high & low level abstraction" seem to play important role on data analysis and discussion, Authors should clarify their meaning earlier in the introduction section (in the present form there is only a non-explained mention. L. 58) 4. Authors should elucidate whether they have taken into account in their research design, findings regarding 'the quality' of e-books, as presented in L 113-126 5. Materials and Methods: 5 educators took part in the reported study. How individual characteristics (education, experience, personality traits) of each educator have been taken into account? 6. According to the reported procedure 'traditional book' reading was always	1. Our research attempts to fall within the framework set by other relevant researches so that the results are comparable, and governed by the same level of documentation. All previous investigations that we refer are related to a limited sample and other scientific limitations, and urge the scientific community to further confirmation. The integration of technological tools is gradual and always has scientific interest in monitoring through time. We believe, moreover, that this study is interested in digital literacy, regarding Greece, a country with specific characteristics on digital literacy, which is influenced by the context of advanced countries, but lags behind in the use of technologies. 2. The abstract is improved according to the adjustments. 3. The clarification was made based on a system of categories established by previous researches, who studied the level of abstraction (abstraction level) of extratextual interactions between parents and children reading stories from traditional books (fiction book) (Natsiopoulou, Souliotis, & Kyridis, 2006; Hammet, Van Kleek, & Huberty,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	performed first, followed by the 'e-book reading'. A counter-balanced presentation of the above readings would be more appropriate in order to avoid carry-over effects between tasks. 7. It is not clear to me, how the means presented in Table 3 were calculated 8. Table 4 and the following text (Ls 196 – 201) present data regarding children's persistence during e-book reading. However, in the Methods section, <u>is not mentioned how persistence was measured</u>. In the case that – as stated in L. 196 – educators asked children to report a yes or no, in my opinion these self-reports of preschoolers pose a serious problem of reliability. Additionally, in the same paragraph the use of the term attachment seems inappropriate. 9. Discussion: The findings discussed in Ls 260-268, in my opinion are not supported by the data obtained. Authors did not measure children's attention span, so they cannot conclude the reported claims (see also point 9 above). 10. Conclusion: This section is too general and does not seem to be tightly linked with the findings of the study. Ethical Issues: Authors should clarify whether they obtained parents' informed consent	2003; Neuman, 2996). 4. We took into account, for the choice of e-BOOK, the relevant quality elements. Performed the relevant clarification in manuscript. 5. The criteria for selecting the particular educators were to work for this preschool center, to have familiarity with children, to be willing to participate in the research and to attend a seminar for the purpose of the research project. The adoption of other criteria such as education, experience, personality traits and other capabilities, was considered to create the research bias conditions since the interest of the research focuses on the type of book rather than the teaching ability of the educator (Inserted in the main text.). 6. The order of the two types of reading was changing and it was not always the same so as not to affect the result by the order of reading type (Inserted in the main text.). 7. It concerns the application of statistical method of comparison of the means through the "Paired Samples T Test", individual for each type of children's insertions during the reading of traditional book and e-Book. 8. There were not the children the ones to answer directly by a "yes" or "no". The "yes" or "no" refers to the final judgment of educators on persistence of children, which were based on a detailed descriptive assessment,
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		commonly followed by five educators. 9. As discussed in the above point (8), the educators considered the persistence of children, and therefore we believe that the bibliographical commentary is associated with the data surveyed in this article. 10. We believe it is a documented reasoning that makes the findings of our work usable in the educational process. Ethical Issues: All parents of children who participated in the investigation were informed. No objection has been expressed about it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Avoid the use of personal pronoun 'we'. Its use creates the impression that authors conducted the reported research (l. 41, 45 etc.) 2. Inappropriate use of the term 'survey' 3. L. 65- 66: The sentence is incomplete (Children's participation..... spontaneous). 4. L. 105-106: Incomplete sentence (Others observed and others). 5. L. 115. Traditional books can be attributed 6. Use past tense to report results 7. The whole manuscript suffers from a language problem and should be edited by a native speaker	We made the related corrections
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		