Book Name:	**An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_4233**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Development of Metacognition: How It Defines and How It Can Be Done**
Type of the Article	**Book Chapter**

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Conducting a study on metacognition is valuable; however, it is essential to incorporate a broader range of sources to strengthen the research. The discussion should not be predominantly limited to the findings of only five studies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is not very appropriate because metacognition is not a concept that can be done; rather, it is a concept that can be enhanced or strengthened. Instead of defining metacognition itself, the emphasis should be placed on what defines it. So, as a recommendation, the title can be: " Enhancing Metacognition: What are the Defining Factors". The author can think of alternative titles as well.	
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.	Under second heading, in addition to summarizing the findings from the five main studies examined, including findings from other research that align with or contradict these main studies will strengthen this section. A more extensive literature review should be conducted. Throughout this section, consistently mentioning the authors' names of the summarized scientific studies at multiple points in the summary will prevent confusion with newly added sources. It is good that the author of the section includes their own comments; however, additional sources should be incorporated to further substantiate these comments.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is necessary to support the views stated by referencing various sources and findings. Instead of directly moving to the conclusions, the findings of the main studies in this research should be discussed in light of the literature. Then, the conclusions should be presented along with recommendations that align with the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references include older sources, which are certainly valuable; however, accumulation of knowledge is crucial in scientific research. Therefore, it is essential to include more recent sources as well. The literature review should be expanded, and relevant sources should be more frequently cited throughout the text and properly listed in the reference section.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The use of English is good; however, it would be beneficial to review it once more for further refinement.	
Optional/General comments	Pioneering figures in metacognition research, such as Flavell, should also be included to provide a more robust foundation for the study. This study should be strengthened with a more comprehensive literature review and relevant findings from newly identified sources.	

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:	**Betul Altay Ozturk**
Department, University & Country	**Aydin Adnan Menderes University, Turkiye**