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| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **The constructs of mind and language are crucial to understanding the development of the overall capacity of brain architecture to facilitate pattern recognition. Research on the interaction between the cognitive capacities of mind and language that contribute to the brain’s ability to recognise, analyse and respond to patterns in different contexts is very relevant today. There are many studies that examine the phylogeny of language, tracing the evolutionary origin and development of language in humans.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **It will be appropriate to give another title.** |  |
| 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 should be really extended, not repeating the previous material, it should be structured according to the genre: what problem the author solves (the purpose of the article), on what material, by what methods, the course of the research, the conclusions that the author came to (or proved). All these points should be consistently and logically outlined. In addition, the abstract of the article should not contain excessive theorising, but, on the contrary, reflect the essential points of the research conducted.** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Writing a scientific article requires observance of certain rules, the main of which are a well-thought-out structure of the publication and scientific style of presentation. In general, the structure of a scientific article should consist of the following parts: title, abstract, keywords, introduction, literature review, main part (methodology, results), conclusions and further research perspectives. The author should include at least a review of current literature from the last five years.** |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **We agree with the author that this study is important for pedagogical work. Teaching classical culture requires some kind of connection with students who have no knowledge of it. This can be motivation, but it must be stimulated and supported by the teacher. If there is no motivation and/or connection with the student, they will not be able to absorb new knowledge properly or at all.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **In our opinion the article does not contain enough references and they are very old (1934-1990). Undoubtedly Vygotsky L.S., Piaget, J. and others are great scientists in their field, but we should take into account the studies of the last five years first and perhaps include 1-3 references from 1990-2000. There are many studies that are relevant to this paper. E.g.: Douglas H Schultz, Michael W. Cole, Takuya Ito (2021). The human brain's intrinsic network architecture is organized to represent diverse cognitive task information DOI: 10.1101/2021.01.25.428141** |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The quality of the language/English of the paper should be improved to be in line with scholarly communications. Eliminate repetition of words in the same sentence, replacing them with synonyms. Avoid first-person narration of the scientific text. |  |
| Optional/General comments | As we think, in this kind of work there should be at least 20-30 references of 2010-2024 |  |
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