

## Review of: "Assessment of Children's Toys Suitability Index Instrument (Toy Index)"

Instrument (Toy Index)"
Hamed Aghdam <sup>1</sup> 1 Iran University of Medical Sciences
Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.
Review for article: Assessment of Children's Toys Suitability Index Instrument (Toy Index)
Dear author/s
according to your valuable article and due to the related check list, we recommend you to
Title was vague. It need edit. The term of "assessment" was not clear. It is general and vague. There was not any instrument that you are doing assessment. You created an instrument and then assessed it.
Introduction:
It section was too long. Unrelated sentences to the aim of study must be omitted.
The introduction should include a better representation of the main rational of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies (I did not see).
Why authors choose the toys for children aged 3 to 5? What was hypothesis for selection of it? PI clarify, precise and clear.
Methods:
Date of study?
The informative data about the expertise, such as their university degree and especially relative qualifications?
Discussion:
In the discussion part you should write the main(s) finding(s) and specially (novelty) at first and then allude to other

Qeios ID: 2809FA · https://doi.org/10.32388/2809FA



studies.

Thank you