

Review Form 3

r

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127168
Title of the Manuscript:	ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE APPRAISAL OF GRADUATE SCHOOL STUDENTS: BASIS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
Type of the 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>

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 holds considerable importance for the scientific community, particularly for researchers and educators focusing on language proficiency and communicative competence in non-native English contexts. By examining the specific challenges faced by Filipino graduate students, it contributes valuable insights that are applicable in regions where English is both an official and educational language, yet not the first language of most students. The manuscript's findings underscore the complex relationship between English proficiency and communicative competence, revealing areas where targeted educational interventions could enhance student outcomes. I appreciate the manuscript for its methodological rigor, contextual relevance, and its potential to inform future language enhancement programs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title effectively encapsulates the study's scope but could be enhanced for clarity. Including the phrase "in the Bicol Region, Philippines" would better situate the study's context for an international readership.	
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.	One minor suggestion to enhance clarity could be to briefly interpret the moderately positive correlation's practical significance (what it suggests about the link between proficiency and competence). However, the abstract is sufficiently detailed and does not require additional data on the results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and well-organized.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor through a well-defined methodology, including a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design that aligns with the study's objectives. The use of validated instruments, such as the EF SET for measuring English proficiency, adds to its reliability, while appropriate statistical tests ensure a comprehensive analysis of the data. The sample size of 118 graduate students, selected through purposive sampling, is adequate for examining trends and relationships within the population. Its adherence to ethical standards, along with clear data reporting and statistically supported conclusions, makes it scientifically robust and technically sound, allowing the findings to be confidently applied in relevant educational contexts.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The manuscript's references are pertinent to the study's focus on English language proficiency and communicative competence among graduate students in the Philippines. However, several references are over five years old, and the inclusion of more recent studies would enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth. I recommend removing irrelevant references, such as the one on digit fusion in mouse embryos, and incorporating recent, context-specific studies on English language proficiency and communicative competence in the Philippines.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is largely appropriate for scholarly communication, but minor improvements could enhance clarity like correcting occasional grammar issues. Minor edits for conciseness and coherence would help the article fully meet academic standards</p> <p><u>Abstract - Study Design Suggested Revision:</u> The study employed a descriptive-comparative-correlational design, utilizing content-validated and reliability-tested questionnaires alongside the English First Standardized English Test (EF SET), a standardized English proficiency test.</p> <p><u>Abstract -Result Suggested Revision:</u> Chi-square analysis found no significant relationship between communicative competence appraisal and proficiency level. However, a moderately positive correlation (Pearson's $r = 0.4691$, $p < 0.00001$) was observed between language proficiency and communicative competence.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally well-structured, minor improvements in clarity and readability are recommended. Simplifying complex sentences, correcting minor grammatical errors, and updating references would enhance the overall quality. With these refinements, the study holds strong potential to contribute to scholarly discourse on language proficiency in multilingual educational settings.</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:	Princess L. Varona
Department, University & Country	Saint Michael College of Caraga, Philippines