

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

Christie Klimas¹

¹ DePaul University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting topic and explores a topic different than the marketability of toys, thus addressing a research gap.

The published version could be much improved with English language editing as well as a more thorough and detailed lead in to the question. More methodological detail is necessary on the expert weighting scale as well as other factors (detailed below).

It's not clear how the index developed in this paper compares to the methods used to evaluate toys in other countries' legislation (or by product manufacturers). Indeed, a more thorough explanation of what has already been done in this field is an essential improvement needed.

More attention to putting these results in the context of what other research has done in the discussion is also necessary.

In the first paragraph of your introduction, it would be useful to include statistics on the increase in the development of children's games. For example, how many new games are created each year (on average) or something like a statistic that indicates the rate of growth in new games (not just sales).

In the second paragraph, I would remove "attraction phenomenon", leaving just "...market, industries that..."

Also in the second paragraph, rephrase the paragraph about less involvement of children in their imagination. This could be rephrased to something like: "but this structural complexity reduces the potential for imaginative play."

In paragraph 3, remove "Based on", changing the sentence with: "Studies monitoring the quality and safety..."

Rephrase the sentence on the withdrawal of toys for clarity.

In paragraph 4, you mention the European Commission's enforcement of the act, but you don't specify the act or legislation that you're referring to.

In the final paragraph of your introduction, the author mentions that there are no instruments developed to determine the quality of toys in the Malaysian market. It would be useful, perhaps essential, to have an assessable definition of quality at this point in the introduction.

Similarly, it is essential to provide more detail on the expertise of the "experts". What field/matter studies was used as the basis for knowledge, expertise, etc.? The guidelines for choosing experts are general to the point where the reader is not

sure that they have expertise.

Make sure your methods are written in past tense.

Does Table 1 list all indicators and sub-indicators considered or just those selected? It would be useful in the methods or appendix to list all considered indicators, then determine which the experts considered most important in the results.

It's not clear from the methods, or text more generally, how the weighting in table 2 was completed. It is necessary to detail the equation and methodology in this paper so that the readers can follow this calculation.

The difference between the Local Weighted (LW) and Global Weighted (GW) should also be detailed with equations included for these calculations.