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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**I would make the title clearer. Do not use an unknown acronym.** **Possible revision: College Students' Extracurricular Reading and Talents Cultivation in China.** **Under Section 3, you stated you distributed a questionnaire. With such a large sample, you need to first *a priori* describe how you constructed the questionnaire/piloted it for validity and reliability and secondly, did you conduct *post hoc* validity/reliability analysis. If you did neither, then these are serious limitations. For example, you did not seem to ask who does *no* 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?** **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.** **How did you collect and analyze results?** **You suggest students are committed to reading for class, but question 6 says surfing the web is a high priority (rivals studying).** **You state students are not lazy, but you did not investigate this opinion article. What does lazy even mean?** **Lacking two key sections. You should have a limitations section and a conclusion section.** **Overall, very happy with this descriptive paper.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**David C. Coker**
Department, University & Country	**Fort Hays State University, USA**