

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_93018
Title of the Manuscript:	Revolutionizing Large Classes and Helping the Silently Excluded Learners through Language Inclusive Practices
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Introduction is too short and does not include any references at all. Research Rationale could be part of Introduction. On page 2, line 4 and 5, “. . . with close to four to six arms of the same class” is not clear. “This study, therefore, seeks to . . .” should be on a separate paragraph. You have to explain what the <u>Table 1</u> is about. In your Literature Review, you only reviewed two sources: Olajide (2005) and Akinwamide (2015). There must be a lot more. Also, in your review of Akinwamide, (in order to cover your review) you go to too much detail as how he has done his work such as sampling, pre-test, post-test, population and . . . There is no need for all these details. In your Theoretical Analysis, you seem primarily to have used the work Vygotsky and a little from Tompkins and Elbow as the only sources of references. Where does the other information come from? You have to reference them Conclusion and recommendations are short. You only use 7 references and only two of them are 2015 the rest are very old. You should have used more and up-to-dated references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vahid Motamedi
Department, University & Country	Kharazmi University, Iran