

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_130062
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Early English Exposure for Rural Left-Behind Children: Integrating Home-Kindergarten Collaboration and Learning Qualities Development
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study topic is crucial to modern day marginalized and disadvantaged students especially in in sprawling towns and emergencies. However the statistics and figures despite qualitative orientation chosen numbers would add flavour to responsiveness of leaders to the problem.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitably constructed and understandable.	
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.	Author advised to review the abstract to cover 150-200 words and ensure it is informative to the reader on the problem, objective, unit of analysis, research method, solutions in recommendation preceded by findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	At some point a lot of words are redundant and they end up overshadowing the gist of the article. presentation of data be put in more precise and concise form. Repetition of some words makes some of it monotonous.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Ok	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is quality is good	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ssimbwa Peter
Department, University & Country	Nkumba University, Uganda