

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_88446
Title of the Manuscript:	On China’s College Students' Extracurricular Reading and Talents Cultivation: Based on a Survey in SCUT
Type of the 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>I would make the title clearer. Do not use an unknown acronym.</p> <p>1. Possible revision: College Students' Extracurricular Reading and Talents Cultivation in China.</p> <p>2. Under Section 3, you stated you distributed a questionnaire. With such a large sample, you need to first <i>a priori</i> describe how you constructed the questionnaire/piloted it for validity and reliability and secondly, did you conduct <i>post hoc</i> validity/reliability analysis. If you did neither, then these are serious limitations. For example, you did not seem to ask who does <i>no</i> reading, making future questions unreliable. A large section does less than 30 minutes per day. Also, you ask about free time with overlapping ranges, e.g., <4 hours and 4-6. If someone picked 4, which category?</p> <p>3. You stated you randomly distributed the survey. How? To whom? Describe the setting, sample, and population. Random would mean everyone on campus had an equal chance. I bet that was not the case.</p> <p>4. How did you collect and analyze results?</p> <p>5. You suggest students are committed to reading for class, but question 6 says surfing the web is a high priority (rivals studying).</p> <p>6. You state students are not lazy, but you did not investigate this opinion article. What does lazy even mean?</p> <p>7. Lacking two key sections. You should have a limitations section and a conclusion section.</p> <p>Overall, very happy with this descriptive paper.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the comment. All of the reviewer's opinions have been followed. Please check revision in the revised version, which is highlighted in yellow color.</p> <p>1. Yes, the title has been revised.</p> <p>2-4. Yes. One section ("3. Methodology") has been added to illustrate relevant things in details.</p> <p>5-6. Yes, explanation and revision has been made.</p> <p>7. Yes, conclusion section is provided, and limitation section is added.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	