



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	*The author should specifies the research variables; to clarify: 1) The comparison fields between traditional book, and e-book. Is it in the topic; scientific knowledge, or stories, if stories, which kinds of stories? 2) Sample variables; similarities and differences. 3) Personal abilities, and/or characteristics that author would measure. *All these notices are repeated through the paper until the discussion and conclusion. This may be seen as lines 94:139, also, as examples: 1) Lines 37&38: Will the author measure sample language development? This isn't mentioned in study aims, while you mentioned preference in general; lines 140:142. 2) Lines 77:80: To what extent your selected topic will affect mental, social, and linguistic development? The same, line 90. *For statistical manipulation, it will be better to use MANOVA to study the effect of 2 dependent variables: traditional reading versus e-book, which will affect multi children preferences. The author should specify preference to, for example; memory in items: 1,2,6. Attitudes: 3,4, then thinking, socially in 5 and cognitively in 7. As shown in table 1, line, 167. *To what extent the author control h/her sample, so that, their responses with ICT will	The research was not seeking the improvement in language or the affect in mental or social development. The citations relate to the general benefits that might have the e-BOOK. Thank you for your helpful comment. Following your suggestion multivariate analysis MANOVA was tested. Some interesting findings emerged (eg preference is influenced by the memory capacity "1,2,6" that occurred during the reading of printed books). However this kind of group factorization, alter the reasoning of our survey which follows the existing literature and distinguishes spontaneous interventions in the 7 categories, which are divided into low abstraction categories (clarification, questions for clarification, names) and to high abstraction categories (relating to real life, recalling). This distinction has particular linguistic interest and is not associated with other cognitive abilities of children. Your suggestion gives us the impetus for further analyzes in our future research. 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.).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not be affected with their knowledge after representing traditional reading? I think, it may be better if the researcher choses different stories; so that children responses in e-book secession, be free from any knowledge they gain in previous tradition reading secession.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Title; vs should be versus. 2) Line 14; word states, will be better to delete; as it refers to US, more than talking about ICT in general or in Greece.	ok it is corrected ok it is corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Important topic, in general.	