



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. It appears, in the MATERIALS AND METHODS section, that the story was always read to the child from the traditional book first and then later read on the computer. If this was the method, was there a reason why the story presentation method wasn't counter-balanced? This needs some clarification. 2. It would be very helpful to the reader if the percentage of insertions was collapsed within the categories of low versus high level abstractions to give an overall percentage of low versus high level abstractions for traditional and e-book formats. 3. In lines 182-184, the authors state that children who make more low-level abstractions prefer the e-book format. A table or figure is needed to clarify this relationship. 4. In lines 184-186, the authors state that children who make more interventions during traditional book reading preferred the e-book format. This is an interesting finding, but needs a table or figure to help the reader understand the relationship.	1. 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.). 2. Done relative attachment in Table 1. 3. Done, in fig.1 4. Done, in fig.2
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. It would be helpful to move table 1 into the introduction and discuss it earlier in the manuscript to help the reader understand the nature of the low- versus high-level insertions being studied. 2. The introduction needs some reorganization.	1. Done , clarification to the text in the introduction, is referred in Table 1 in order to help the reader understand the nature of the low- versus high-level insertions. 2. The analysis in the introduction is



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Although there are a number of import research articles presented, it is very difficult to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the use of technology either for teaching reading, specifically, or in the preschool setting, more generally. More needs to be said to relate the current study to the existing literature on e-books. 3. Regarding the CONCLUSIONS, I would like to see more discussion regarding the appropriateness of e-books in the preschool setting. I would not really dispute that quality material should be presented (lines 287-294), this question wasn't really addressed in the current study. It would be more relevant to discuss whether e-books offer any advantages over traditional books or if they can be used interchangeably with traditional books.	limited and fragmented because it is not a complete literature review investigation. It draws on some elements of investigations relating to pre-school education, as it is an issue that has extensively been investigated in pre-school level. 3. see as above mentioned
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I would like to note that this is a very important topic and there is not enough research into the use of educational technology in the preschool setting. I believe that this manuscript makes an important contribution in this area.	