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| PART 1: Review Comments |
| 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 manuscript “*Mind-Language, the Expanding Heart of Cognition”* is commendable for its integration of cognitive science, language acquisition, and educational theory. Its detailed exploration of the interplay between mind and language development, supported by references to Vygotsky and Piaget, provides valuable insights and practical applications, particularly in the educational context.However, while Lev Vygotsky’s approach, particularly his emphasis on the Zone of Proximal Development and social interaction, offers profound insights, labeling it “the best” is subjective, as it should be at least considered to give some highlight to works of the mentioned Jean Piaget, as well as the other researchers, e.g., Jerome Bruner, Howard Gardner, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Albert Bandura, Daniel Stern, and Barbara Rogoff, who also contribute valuable perspectives, depending on context and application. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The phrase “Expanding Heart of Cognition” may be seen as somewhat abstract and metaphorical, which could make the title less immediately clear to readers. A more straightforward title might help clarify the manuscript’s content, e.g., “The Role of Mind and Language in Cognitive Development” or “Language and Mind in the Evolution of Cognition”. |  |
| 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 absence of methodological details makes it difficult for the audience to gauge how the research was conducted or what kind of data or evidence was used to support the claims. While the abstract touches on the theoretical basis (??? or in a descriptive way of the known facts) and the stages of cognitive development, it does not specify whether the paper presents empirical research, theoretical analysis, or a combination of both. It is strongly doubtful whether the paper can be considered academically reliable. No references make the comprehension weaker and the register applied for the ideas may be wished to be changed. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | No, not all. Despite the review requirements, the fundamental question remains obvious: research objectives of the paper, which may seem to have strongly impacted the R&D and conclusions.  |  |
| **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.** | The paper needs major revisions to be made to make it sound and look scientific and meet the academic standards. It should focus on IMRAD framework, thus, enabling the author(s) arrive at relevant substantiation and conclusions.The register fails to meet the standards, both in terms of grammar and vocabulary lay-out: the word order in sentences is not followed, personal / blogging style rather than academic is observed throughout the paper, unreadability of several paragraphs is repeated which results in losing a thread.Moreover, there is no scientific background, rather flow of imagination; for instance, where the author provides personal understanding of English to French translation. It is strongly recommended to adjust, as we say in French, ***Paul est nourri par sa mère***, not “Paul est nourripar sa mère”. The verb “nourrir” (to feed) features the past participle “nourri” in the passive voice, meaning ‘fed.’ The phrase “nourripar” is incorrect because it combines the verb and preposition improperly.Next, it is absolutely false to state what is specified in the txet by the author, where all English sentences arrive at the single French translation. It is not so, e.g., FR *Paul est nourri par sa mère* – EN *Paul is fed by his mother*; FR *De la soupe est donnée à Paul par sa mère* – EN *Soup is fed to Paul by his mother* (though a better translation would be “*Soup is given to Paul by his mother*,” as feeding is not usually expressed this way in French).Regarding another example, where the author states, **The verb “donner” has a wider choice. “Le livre a été donné**,”….., it is strongly assumed the author is not the speaker of these 2 languages and may barely comment on translations, unfortunately. It might be advised to explore more the differences between the French to English or vice versa language pair in translation or use other examples for the required purpose. Conclusions are not substantiated as they are based on subjective (im)professional translations suggested by the author.  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | No, they are not. The author should be familiar with the works in this domain and provide the expected theoretical framework to further drawing on the findings. The references mainly round to the works of 2 scholars that leaves out rigorous academic discussion. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Absolutely not. Thorough editing and proofreading are highly encouraged. |  |
| Optional/General comments | It should be left for the editorial office to decide. The mentioned comments are just a few and do not include all the list what shall be revised to make the paper sound more academic. |  |
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|  | **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)*** |  |
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