

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_97255
Title of the Manuscript:	Didactic Material: Road Map for Achieving Teaching and Learning Outcomes for the Implementation of CBA (Competency Based Approach) to English language in Secondary Schools' Curriculum in South West Region.
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. this manuscript is important; but essential revisions are required: A. rephrase the manuscript to make it more like a scholarly article; B. rewrite the 'literature review' part to summary the background and research gap, etc.; C. directly report the actual research findings by table, chart, etc. rather than a simple summary statement; D. read the comments (highlighted in the manuscript) and revise the paper accordingly 2. yes 3. yes; but revision is expected (see the comment) 4. the 'paragraph setting' should be consistent between sections 5. should be scientifically correct after careful revision 6. edit is required to make its settings consistent	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author(s) should read it carefully and revise it accordingly	
Optional/General comments	The authors better to keep their writing consistent. For example, at least 3 types of CBA: 'Competency Based Approach', 'competency-based approach' and 'Competency-Based Approach'	

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:	Mingzeng Sun
Department, University & Country	USA