

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102715
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION IN PRE-WRITING STRATEGY ON STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN IDEA ORGANIZATION AND PARAGRAPHING
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of designing and testing instructional strategies to improve students' skills in composition writing is important. Methodological design is appropriate for the research, but, as I shall argue below at points 4. and 5., its implementation has important failures. Yes, title describes properly its content. Abstract begins with a statement which is not supported by any evidence presented in the manuscript. An ANOVA test is mentioned, but no information of its use appears in the report. These issues should be attended. Structure is correct. I suggest highlighting main subtitles (as Methodology or Results) emphasising their relevance. Besides, some sections could be broadened, presenting a more detailed information. That is the case of Instrument and Experimental Procedure. About the first one, it's implied from section Validity that instrument used was adapted in some way. This process should be informed, as the reasons why it was performed. Referring to the second one, answering questions as the examples I present is important from methodological and didactical perspectives: <i>Was the researcher the teacher of both groups? Composition writing was treated as a curricular content? If so, these tasks were included in assessment? Which are the contents of the lessons, and which was the intentionality of including them? Which were the actions that researcher perform to instruct, guide or direct students?</i> Author's decision about methodological design must be explained. Not equivalent groups in the pretest requires further procedures to study eventual differences in performance that could be attributed to intervention. If experimental group performed better than control one in pretest, result of posttest could be explained by other reasons besides the effect of the intervention. If not, result is stronger. Another issue is that in first paragraph of section Method of Data Analysis authors mention six hypotheses, but the manuscript refers only to two of them. Besides, an ANOVA test is announced to be used for testing the sixth (this intention is expressed at Abstract) However, no ANOVA test's result is presented. This is not acceptable. They are. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some sentence make no sense ("<i>Quasi-experimental research design is a design that exposes the reality of testing if any by comparing two groups.</i>"). "<i>In as much as studies have correlated effective composition writing to a well designed methodological instruction in pre-writing which is a stage where the actual cognitive activities that give writing its hallmark take place, not too many teachers of English allot significant time and effort to this crucial stage of writing.</i>"</p> <p>First time an acronym appears it must be explicated (SS1, WAEC)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Comment [EMLA1]: Redaction. Mention some of the studies.

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Catholic University, Uruguay