



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
They have addressed some of my original concerns, however some others still remain. More specifically 1. According to my view, the rationale of the study should be more highlighted. Authors should point out the "scientific limitations" of previous research – which they mention in their comments. Moreover, in case that the authors believe that their study has a particular interest for the country in which their research has been conducted, this must be clarified in their text. For example, which are "the specific characteristics on digital literacy" that characterize Greece vs other "advanced countries"? 2. The clarification of the terms "high-low level abstraction" should be incorporated in the text, since they play a fundamental role in the research (the reference to the relevant table, in my opinion, is not sufficient). 3. The reported research does not fulfill the strict criteria of an experimental design. 4. The clarification regarding the quality of e-books in the Methods section is too vague and should be further explained 5. I maintain my objections regarding the evaluation of children's persistence. It is still not clarified how educators assessed this construct and thus the relevant reported data and conclusions cannot be considered sufficiently measured 6. Minor remark: Prefer past tense while reporting the results of previous research	1. This was corrected according to your recommendations. 2. Clarifications are further enriched. 3. This has been corrected as "...quasi-experimental design research that utilizes quantitative observation data while future research of high methodological quality is essential for improving our knowledge of effective use of e-books in early childhood education". 4. Further specifications were given. 5. The text was enriched with the relevant clarifications Specifically, as there are no weighted criteria for a relative measurement, the two-pronged version was conventionally adopted, while a scale with more grades was avoided. 6. Corrections were relatively made.