

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121468
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING ZHE JIANG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' BELIEFS AND PERCEPTIONS ON THE USE OF MIND MAPPING TECHNIQUE (MMT) IN EFL READING COMPREHENSION (ERC)
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript deals with an important language skill, which is reading. Reading is a skill which should be acquired by EFL learners. In order to improve that skill, some methods are suggested in literature. In this study mind-mapping is handled and students' perceptions of that technique is researched. It presents important implications for foreign language development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive. Some sentences repeats the same things. I have shown the repeated sentences on the manuscript, and noted that they had better be deleted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It uses two data collection instruments frequently used in research literature, questionnaire and interview. I have noted some of my reservations on the manuscript about some technical issues which should be reconsidered. They are noted in the section of "research approach".	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are enough, some citing problems have been noticed and highlighted in the text.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article should be revised again. There are sentences which are problematic in terms of English grammar. The reviewer tried to show all the sentences which had some grammatical problems and punctuation mistakes, however, the whole manuscript needs to be revised again and again by a grammar checker or a proficient English speaker for its grammaticality.	
Optional/General comments	Although in this form, language is considered as a "minor revision" I believe the grammaticality of sentences are very important in order to make a manuscript sound and robust. So, the grammar issue should be given more attention in the related manuscript. The reviewer added notes on the manuscript. There are some issues about research part, so the researcher should consider them again. In addition, as mentioned above, there are problems with the grammar of the text, so the need to be fixed .	

Review Form 3

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:	Zennure Elgün Gündüz
Department, University & Country	Ardahan University, Türkiye