Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_128870**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Exploring How the ECM Explains Word Learning in Children's First Language Acquisition Compared to Adults' Second Language Acquisition**
Type of the Article	**Academic Research / Qualitative Thematic Article**

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the word learning processes of L1 and L2 learners through the lens of the Emergentist Coalition Model (ECM). The study's findings have significant implications for language learning and teaching practices, highlighting the importance of creating language-rich environments and tailoring instruction to meet the unique needs of learners. Furthermore, the study contributes to our understanding of the ECM framework and its application in both L1 and L2 acquisition contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the main topic of the study. However, I would recommend some minor adjustments to make the title more concise, clear and impactful with enhanced impact. The revised title should be "Word Learning in L1 and L2 Acquisition: A Comparative Analysis through the Emergentist Coalition Model (ECM)".	
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.	The abstract is clear, concise, and well-structured. It effectively summarizes the purpose, methodology, main findings, and implications of the research. While the abstract provides a good overview of the study, it would be helpful to include more specific details, such as the number of participants, the language(s) involved, and the specific word learning strategies employed by L1 and L2 learners. It would also be helpful to highlight what sets this study apart from previous research. For example, does the study provide new insights into the ECM framework or its application to L1 and L2 acquisition? The abstract is well-written and effectively summarizes the study. With a few minor adjustments to add more specificity and emphasize the unique contributions, the abstract can be even more effective in conveying the significance and impact of the study.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The paper explores a significant topic in language acquisition, namely the application of the Emergentist Coalition Model (ECM) to word learning in L1 and L2 acquisition. To further enhance the paper, the author may provide more context about the ECM framework, explore the implications of the findings for language teaching and learning practices, and include more information about the participants and data analysis procedures. The author should add more information about the data analysis procedures, such as the coding scheme and inter-rater reliability. Despite these suggestions, the paper is well-structured, provides valuable insights, and demonstrates a good understanding of the topic, employing a suitable methodology. With some revisions, the paper has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of language acquisition.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference list appears to be comprehensive, with a range of classic and contemporary sources cited. However, thre are a lot of issues with the reeferences style, missing references, ghost intext citations. Even some of the references are quite old (although related and compulsory) (e.g., 1952; 1957; Chomsky, 1965), and it might be beneficial to include more recent studies to provide a more up-to-date perspective on the topic. Some additional references that might be relevant to the study include: 1. Ellis, R. (2008). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.	

	2. Mackey, A. (2012). Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 learning. Oxford University Press. 3. Nation, P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press. Additionally, one of the issues with the references is that most of the references are not cited within the text (E.g. Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic structures. Mouton. Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. MIT Press. Ellis, N. C. (1995). Implicit and explicit learning of languages. Academic Press. etc) Most of the intext references are not present at the end as well (E.g. Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2009; Saito, 2020; etc.) In short, the reference list is highly compromised, and need serious attention. This leads towards plagiarism which is a serious offense.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is well-written, clear, and concise, with proper use of technical terms and concepts.	
Optional/General comments	The paper is well-structured, and the findings provide valuable insights into the differences and similarities between L1 and L2 learners. The paper has the potential to make a significant contribution to the field of language acquisition. However, the reference list is highly compromised, and need serious attention. This leads towards vagueness and plagiarism which is a serious offense. Moreover, some parts of the paper are likely written by AI which makes it compromised.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shahzeb Shafi**
Department, University & Country	**National University of Modern Languages, Pakistan**