

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	Original 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>
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 addresses the ongoing debate regarding the efficacy of silent reading versus oral reading in enhancing reading comprehension among college students. By demonstrating no significant difference between the two methods, the study highlights the need to consider individual learning preferences and contextual factors when selecting reading strategies. The findings contribute to the growing body of research on reading comprehension and provide educators with evidence-based insights to support diverse learners. Furthermore, it opens pathways for future research to explore additional variables, such as text complexity and cognitive styles, in shaping reading outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The suitability of the title depends on how well it reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. If the current title is something like "The Effectiveness of Silent and Oral Reading on Comprehension Outcomes of College Students," it is descriptive and suitable. However, it could be refined for clarity and impact.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Titles: "Comparing Silent and Oral Reading: Their Impact on College Students' Reading Comprehension" "Silent vs. Oral Reading: Insights into Comprehension Outcomes in Higher Education" "Evaluating the Role of Silent and Oral Reading Methods in College-Level Comprehension" These options maintain academic tone while ensuring clarity and relevance to the study's findings.</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 of the article provides a general overview of the study, but it could be improved to make it more comprehensive and aligned with standard academic expectations. Here are some suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Suggested Additions: Objective Statement: Explicitly state the study's objective in one concise sentence. For example, "This study investigates the comparative effectiveness of silent and oral reading on comprehension outcomes among college students." Methods Summary: Briefly describe the methodology used, such as the number of participants, the setting, and the tools or processes for measuring comprehension. Key Findings: Clearly summarize the key results, emphasizing the lack of significant difference between the two methods while noting implications for individual learning preferences. Conclusion Statement: Include a brief conclusion highlighting the significance of the findings and the need for further research to understand additional factors.</p> <p>Suggested Deletions: Redundant Statements: Remove overly general or repetitive sentences that do not add value to the abstract. Excessive Background: Avoid including too much background information about reading methods, as it diverts attention from the study's findings. By ensuring the abstract is concise, focused, and includes the study's objective, methodology, results, and conclusions, it will better serve as a summary for potential readers.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in its methodology and interpretation of results. However, the following points should be addressed to ensure accuracy and rigor:</p> <p>Study Design and Methodology:</p> <p>The manuscript should clearly describe the study design, including details such as the sample size, participant selection criteria, and specific procedures followed for silent and oral reading tests. Without these details, it is difficult to fully assess the validity of the findings.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis:</p> <p>The statistical methods used to compare the comprehension outcomes of silent and oral reading need to be explicitly mentioned. This includes the type of statistical test, significance level, and effect size.</p> <p>Consistency with References:</p> <p>The findings align with some of the referenced studies, but the discussion could benefit from a more robust comparison with prior research. For instance, how do the findings align or diverge from studies like Kim et al. (2019) or Mendoza & Cruz (2024)?</p> <p>Terminology Precision:</p> <p>Terms such as "comprehension outcomes" should be consistently defined and used throughout the manuscript to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>Balanced Conclusion:</p> <p>While the manuscript concludes there is no significant difference between silent and oral reading, it should emphasize the importance of considering individual differences, such as learning preferences and content complexity, in choosing reading strategies.</p> <p>If the above points are addressed, the manuscript will better demonstrate its scientific accuracy and contribute to the field of educational psychology and reading instruction.</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 in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and relevant sources, such as studies from 2019 to 2024. However, there are a few points to consider:</p> <p>Recency and Relevance:</p> <p>Most references are recent and align well with the topic. However, adding more studies from 2020 onward that directly compare silent and oral reading comprehension could strengthen the foundation of the research.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Diversity of Sources:</p> <p>While the current references are useful, including additional perspectives from broader reading comprehension studies or meta-analyses could enhance the depth of the literature review. Suggested Additional References:</p> <p>Some additional references that may be helpful: Pardo, L. S. (2004). What every teacher needs to know about comprehension. <i>The Reading Teacher</i>, 58(3), 272-280. (Explores comprehension strategies). National Reading Panel (2000). <i>Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.</i> (Offers foundational insights into reading strategies). Consistency in Citation Style:</p> <p>Ensure all references follow a consistent format (e.g., APA style) and include complete details such as DOI or URL where applicable. By incorporating additional references and ensuring consistency, the manuscript's reference list will be even more robust and comprehensive.</p>	
<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, but there are some areas where improvements could be made to enhance clarity and readability:</p> <p>Clarity and Precision:</p> <p>Some sentences are lengthy or contain complex structures that may be hard for readers to follow. Simplifying and breaking them into shorter sentences would help improve readability. Example: "While the study did not find a significant advantage for either method, individual learning preferences and reading material may influence the effectiveness of each approach." This could be reworded as: "Although the study did not find a significant advantage for either method, factors like individual learning preferences and reading material may affect their effectiveness." Consistency in Terminology:</p> <p>Ensure consistent use of terms throughout the manuscript. For instance, "reading styles" and "reading methods" are used interchangeably in the abstract and introduction. Consistency would enhance coherence. Minor Grammatical Adjustments:</p> <p>There are minor grammatical issues, such as inconsistent verb tenses and article usage. For instance, "influencing the effectiveness" could be better stated as "may influence the effectiveness." Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Revise sections with more complex terminology or phrasing to ensure that they are accessible to a broader audience within the scientific community. For example, technical or academic jargon should be used when necessary, but always with sufficient explanation or simplification. In summary, while the manuscript's language is generally appropriate, a thorough review for clarity, grammatical accuracy, and consistency would further enhance its quality for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Xerxes M. Budomo
Department, University & Country	Western Governors University, USA