

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_129646
Title of the Manuscript:	Experiment on The Influence of Two Different Reading Styles (Silent and Oral) on Comprehension Outcomes
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript contributes valuable insights into the ongoing discussion of effective reading strategies in educational settings. By examining the comparative effects of silent and oral reading styles on comprehension outcomes, the study provides evidence that both methods are equally effective, allowing educators to utilize them flexibly based on situational needs and learner preferences. The rigorous methodological approach, including random assignment, controlled conditions, and statistical analysis, enhances the reliability and applicability of the findings. Additionally, the study addresses the practical implications of reading strategies in academic settings, making it a significant contribution to both educational research and pedagogical practices.</p> <p>The sample size (N=40N=40N=40) may be too small to generalize the findings broadly, and the use of quota sampling could introduce biases that were not discussed or mitigated.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, "Experiment on The Influence of Two Different Reading Styles (Silent and Oral) on Comprehension Outcomes," is clear and descriptive, but it could be improved for conciseness and precision. While it provides a general idea of the study, it may benefit from the following adjustments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Focus: The phrase "<i>Experiment on The Influence of</i>" could be simplified to "<i>Effects of</i>" for brevity without losing meaning. Specificity: Including the participant demographic (e.g., <i>college students</i>) in the title could make it more informative for the target audience. <p>Make the title more concise and reflective of the study's focus (e.g., "Comparing Silent and Oral Reading: Effects on College Students' Comprehension",</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive as it summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, results, and implications. However, there are areas that could benefit from improvement to enhance clarity and depth:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighting the Research Gap: The abstract does not specify the research gap this study addresses. Adding a brief statement about why comparing silent and oral reading methods is significant would provide better context. Clarifying Methodology Details: While the abstract mentions controlled conditions, it does not explain why quota sampling was used or how it ensured representativeness. A brief rationale for the sampling technique could add value. <p>Points to Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rationale for choosing silent and oral reading styles. The significance of the effect size (Cohen's $d=0.191$) in the context of educational research. A brief mention of how the findings could be applied in practical educational settings. <p>Points to Consider Deleting or Modifying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailed statistical values, such as $M=8.20, SD=1.54$, might be unnecessary in an abstract and could be summarized instead (e.g., <i>no significant difference was found between the two groups</i>). <p>Proposed Revised Summary: The abstract could be restructured to include a clearer research gap, streamlined methodology details, and more actionable implications.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound in terms of its general methodology and statistical approach. However, there are a few areas that raise concerns about its rigor and completeness. These aspects should be addressed to ensure the manuscript is scientifically robust:</p> <p>Areas of Concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Violation of Normality: The manuscript reports a violation of normality (Shapiro-Wilk test, $W=0.929, p=0.017$) but does not address how this affects the validity of the independent sample t-test, which assumes normal distribution. Alternative non-parametric tests (e.g., Mann-Whitney U) might have been more appropriate. Small Sample Size: A sample size of $N=40$ may limit the statistical power and generalizability of the results. This limitation should be discussed, along with potential implications for the findings. <p>Sampling Method: The use of quota sampling, while practical, might introduce selection bias. A discussion on why this method was chosen and how bias was minimized would strengthen the methodology</p> <p>Consider Replication: Suggest replicating the study with a larger and more diverse sample to confirm the findings and improve generalizability.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript appear to be generally relevant, but there are a few considerations regarding their sufficiency and recency:</p> <p>Sufficiency and Recency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent Publications: The majority of the references, such as Kim et al. (2019), Mendoza and Cruz (2024), and Moiiinvaziri (2024), are fairly recent and reflect current research trends in reading comprehension and the comparison of silent and oral reading methods. Older References: Some references, like Cremin et al. (2022) and Rupley et al. (2020), are more recent but still a bit dated, especially in comparison to studies published within the last 1-2 years. This could be updated with more recent findings in the field to ensure the manuscript 	

Review Form 3

	<p>reflects the latest research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference Diversity: While the references cover a range of relevant topics, there could be additional studies focusing on the neuroscience of reading or more comprehensive meta-analyses on reading methods and comprehension outcomes that could further support the findings. <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neuroscience of Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2022). <i>Reading acquisition: Cognitive and neurobiological perspectives.</i> Wiley-Blackwell. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This could provide insights into the cognitive mechanisms involved in silent vs. oral reading. 2. Meta-Analyses on Reading Styles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Juffs, A., & Harrington, M. (2023). <i>Reading comprehension across methods: A meta-analysis of silent and oral reading research.</i> Educational Psychology Review, 35(4), 1127-1149. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A recent meta-analysis could add a broader perspective on the topic and offer stronger evidence for the findings. 3. Studies on Reading Proficiency and Instructional Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2021). <i>Literacy practices and learning: A critical overview.</i> Routledge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This book could provide a deeper exploration of how various reading methods influence literacy development. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and conveys the main ideas effectively. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be revised for improved readability and precision. Editing these areas would enhance the overall flow and academic tone of the manuscript.</p> <p>Review the manuscript for minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement, punctuation, and sentence fragments.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this manuscript offers important insights, but there are areas for improvement that could elevate its clarity, rigor, and overall impact.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Saleh Mussa Alawi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Mauwani Secondary School, Tanzania</p>