

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102257
Title of the Manuscript:	A Structural Relationship Model of Communicative Competence
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes. This is a very interesting paper on "A Structural Relationship Model of Communicative Competence".</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>No. The interpretation of P Value &gt;.05 in the <math>\chi^2</math> test is reversed. This paper requires statistics that demonstrate the scientific correctness of the model, such as the distance between words in the model.</b></p> <p>Table 5 shows the correlation coefficient values. It is correct to say that there is an association, but the writing method of the significance level should be written in an appropriate way. Table 7 also has an inappropriate way of describing the significance level. P-value P-value instead of (&gt;0.05) Isn't (p&lt;.05)? Please reconsider how to write statistics as a whole.</p> <p>6. <b>No. Some papers are partially cited but not listed in the bibliography, so it is necessary to check. See attachment.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hiroko Kanoh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University Corporation Yamagata University, Japan</b>