

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJESS_98820
Title of the Manuscript:	BENEFITS OF COMMUNICATIVE METHOD OF TEACHING GRAMMAR IN A BHUTANESE HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL: A QUALITATIVE STUDY
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community in the sense that it tackles the benefits of communicative method of teaching grammar which will play a vital role on how the students may expressed themselves and write different papers in the future. With this, the quality of education in a way how the students will write and expressed effectively will have a direct impact in the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article was comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient enough</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>1. For the introduction, the way it was written was very comprehensive. All the details needed to be tackled were included which will show why the study must be conducted. However, in the last paragraph, it seems the reason why the respondents conduct this study were not properly explained. Improve the last part or paragraph of the introduction by explaining why the said study were conducted.</p> <p>2. Disregard this comment/suggestion if the journal where the paper was intended to be submitted and published must include the statement of the problem, the objectives of the study and research question as separate entity.</p> <p>3. The methodology was written comprehensively.</p> <p>4. The result was written comprehensively. All the data needed were explained very well and necessary supporting statements were included.</p> <p>5. The conclusion was comprehensive. However, try to reduce its length if possible.</p> <p>6. The limitation of the study was stated very well.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jomell M. Santiago
Department, University & Country	Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines