

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99471
Title of the Manuscript:	TASK-BASED LEARNING (TBL) APPROACH: AN EFFECTIVE METHOD FOR IMPROVING ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION SKILLS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN MOROGORO MUNICIPALITY, TANZANIA
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>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>Yes, this manuscript opens up a relatively neglected research area, the application of TBL to pupils in Tanzania. The research is applied to a neglected part of the developing world.</p> <p>The title is appropriate and inform the reader about the research.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is a succinct summary of the article</p> <p>Generally fine, though the Introduction is perhaps a little long</p> <p>Yes, the use of statistics is correct and appropriate for the study, well applied to the data.</p> <p>References are fine, given the topic there are an appropriate range of very recent and older references. No issues.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, no issues, well written and obviously proofread.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Section 3.2 could be broken down to more subsections.</p> <p>I would have liked to have seen an explicit aim to the research, this could then be referred to in the conclusion, as clearly there has been an aim, it is just implied.</p> <p>Section 2.0 mentions '<i>The analyses were conducted based on the research questions</i>', yet there are no explicit research questions in the article.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ian Watson
Department, University & Country	Northumbria University, England