

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_101230
Title of the Manuscript:	Considering Culture in Design of Coding Toolkits for Young Learners in Developing Countries in Africa: Literature Review
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. It presents an overview and some discussion/concerns about issues related to the Design of Coding Toolkits for Young Learners in Developing Countries in Africa. Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. It could be more complete, if the literature review was made using a systematic approach, like PRISMA or similar. Yes. Some typos must be corrected. Ex: Key words -> Keywords. Please check all the text. Conclusions, as it is, are more a summary. In conclusions you must make clear the big findings and future work.	Ok Ok Ok Ok Ok Ok
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair. In my opinion the text must be all checked to avoid typos.	Ok
Optional/General comments	Interesting paper and topic. Conclusion must be improved.	Thanks

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)	