

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100255
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDENTS' CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES IN EXTENSIVE LISTENING CLASS
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>	<p>Yes, it is. It focuses on a skill which is normally neglected for pedagogical reasons. However, listening is Th starting point for acquisition of any language for speaking and socialisation.</p> <p>Yes, suitable.</p> <p>It's quite comprehensive, but research questions should be transferred to research methodology section. In stead, there should be a sentence about the validation of the hypothesis in the abstract.</p> <p>Appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, very much</p> <p>Quite sufficient.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire manuscript can be further condensed avoiding the repetition of ideas. 2. Formal standard written language is preferable in scientific manuscripts. 3. Review of the literature should end with epistemological gap. 4. De limitation of the study is important in methodology section as much as limitations in the concluding part. 5. Recommendations/suggestions could have been made in the context of the study so that policy makers can benefit. 6. Conclusion should discuss to what extent could the study address the research questions and if the hypothesis is validated. 7. Results can be discussed only in terms of percentage not absolute numbers. 8. Since it's a qualitative study, more participants should have been considered. Ten participants cannot be representative of the population. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language is good but greater care should be taken to avoid slips and informal expressions. 2. Expressions highlighted in red to be deleted or reconsidered. 3. Alternative expressions highlighted within parentheses in green are suggestions. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The researcher can consider the points mentioned above and then finalise the manuscript for publication.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeyaraj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India