

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_106166
Title of the Manuscript:	Using Sentence Translation to assess Bilinguality of Bhutanese ESL Learners
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. The study offers some interesting insights into translation behaviors and balanced bilingualism among adult Bhutanese ESL learners. However, the significance of this study is limited by methodological issues. For example, relying solely on translation tasks provides an incomplete picture of bilingual proficiency, and the translation tasks focusing on one grammatical aspect can hardly reflect one's overall translation competence or overall level in sentence processing. The current translation tasks can hardly provide a complete picture of how well one has acquired L2 grammar, either, since the tasks focused on active and passive voices. In all, more rigorous methods and analyses are needed to demonstrate more scientific importance of this study. The study has significant room for improvement.</p> <p>2. No, the title can be further improved. I suggest that the author should change "bilingualism" into "bilingual proficiency" or "translation competence", which is more commonly used in the literature of bilingualism and second language acquisition.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract is not comprehensive enough. At least the author should mention the sample size. Besides, I have the following suggestions about the abstract. suggestion 1: degree of bilinguality → levels of bilingual proficiency suggestion 2: the second and third sentences are almost the same (The study used a questionnaire on bilingual profile to first determine the participant's history, attitude, preferences and proficiency of both the participant's first language (Dzongkha) and their second language (English). First, a bilingual profile questionnaire was administered to determine the participants' history, attitudes, preferences, and proficiency in both their first language (Dzongkha) and second language (English).) suggestion 3: suggesting a balanced bilingualism among the participants.--> suggesting balanced bilingual proficiency among the participants.</p> <p>4. Yes. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The study design has significant room for improvement. For example, we do not know whether the two translation tasks of different directions were homogeneous and comparable. Even if the two translation tasks were homogeneous in difficulty levels and other relevant factors, relying solely on translation tasks hardly provide a complete picture of bilingual proficiency (which comprises reading, writing, listening, speaking, and other relevant skills), and the translation tasks focusing on one grammatical aspect (active and passive voices) can hardly reflect one's overall grammar competence, or translation competence, or overall level in sentence processing.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. The language quality of this article needs further improvement before it is publishable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Since the study involved human participants, I suggest that the author state clearly in the Method part whether the study has obtained ethical approval from what organization and state the ethical approval number, too, and if there is no ethical approval, explain clearly why.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yinghui Li
Department, University & Country	Centre for Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China