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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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 valuable to the scientific community as it addresses foundational literacy gaps through a contextualized, evidence-based intervention for kindergarten learners. By employing the ADDIE model and involving expert validation, it demonstrates how locally developed materials can enhance early reading skills, classroom engagement, and pedagogical effectiveness in underserved educational settings. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is generally appropriate as it reflects the study’s focus on developing and evaluating a reading intervention for kindergarten pupils. However, it may benefit from being shortened and more academic in tone to enhance clarity, focus, and appeal to a broader research audience beyond the local context |  |
| 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 generally clear and informative, effectively outlining the purpose, methodology, and findings of the study. It explains the use of the ADDIE model and highlights the contextual relevance of Mary’s TutoRead. However, it would benefit from including the number of participants, duration of the intervention, and specific results to show measurable impact. A brief mention of implementation challenges and a stronger emphasis on the broader implications for curriculum development or policy would enhance its academic value. Some sentences can be made more concise, and repetition should be minimized. Including a forward-looking statement or recommendation for future research would give the abstract a stronger conclusion. |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically valid, using appropriate methods and frameworks like ADDIE and IPO. Findings are clearly presented and supported by expert validation and observation. It effectively addresses early literacy needs. Minor improvements in structure, clarity, and discussion of limitations would enhance its academic rigor and broader research impact. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | while the references cover key areas, there is room for improvement by incorporating more recent publications from the last 3-5 years to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest advancements and trends in early childhood education and literacy interventions. This will strengthen the academic rigor and relevance of the study |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript’s English language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. It demonstrates clear and coherent expression, appropriate academic tone, and mostly correct grammar and syntax. Minor improvements in sentence structure and word choice could enhance readability and flow, but overall, the language effectively conveys the research content to an academic audience. |  |
| Optional/General comments | **PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT**  Introduction  In the introduction, it is recommended to clarify the background of the problem by incorporating up-to-date data and relevant references, while explicitly highlighting the research gap. The research objectives should be more focused and measurable to help readers immediately grasp the unique contribution of the study. Using concise and precise language will also improve the appeal and clarity of this section.  Literature Review  The literature review should be expanded by including the latest studies that support the theoretical framework and methodology used. It is important to organize references thematically to create a more systematic and easy-to-follow flow of ideas. Adding critical evaluations of previous studies will strengthen the justification for conducting this research.  Methodology  The methodology section needs to be detailed with specific descriptions of the procedures, instruments, and data analysis techniques employed. Including explanations about the validity and reliability of the instruments will enhance the credibility of the research. If possible, adding a flowchart or diagram illustrating the research process will help readers visually understand the steps taken.  Results and Discussion  For the results section, it is advisable to present data in a more structured manner using informative tables and graphs to facilitate interpretation. The discussion should be deeper by linking the findings to existing theories and previous research, as well as explaining practical implications. Avoid repeating data and focus on critical analysis that highlights the study’s contributions.  Conclusion and Recommendations  The conclusion should be formulated clearly and concisely, emphasizing the main findings and the study’s contribution to the field. Recommendations should be concrete and applicable, both for practice and future research. Including limitations of the study will provide a realistic scope and context for the findings.  References  Ensure that all references follow a consistent citation format aligned with the target journal’s guidelines. Double-check the completeness of reference details and avoid outdated or less relevant sources. Adding references from primary sources and reputable journals will improve the academic quality of the manuscript. |  |
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