

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127544
Title of the Manuscript:	Code-Switching in University English Classrooms: Business English Students' Perceptions of ESP Learners
Type of the Article	Original 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 presents a relatively significant aspect of practicing code-switching in an EFL or ESL classroom. I also agree that this topic is a relevant one for research in the field of linguistics. However, the scope of the research seems to be lacking in terms of rigor in analysis and appropriate methodology to arrive at the conclusions and recommendations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title seems confusing. I suggest this revision: Views of ESP Learners on Code-Switching in Business English Classrooms. This title will suggest a much more in-depth exploration of the views of ESP Learners.	
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 seems comprehensive and substantial. It presents key ideas such as the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. Though, there is a need for a more detailed presentation of the methodology.	
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 lacks rigor in the analysis and interpretation of data. The quantitative part of the survey needs a thorough validation and reliability testing to ensure that the goals of the paper are met. On the other hand, there seems to be ambiguity with the analysis of the qualitative data (e.g., coding? framework for data analysis?). Overall, the procedure taken to gather and analyze the data remain a concern and must be reviewed again.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Most of the references are old. The researcher should consider looking for secondary sources or more recent ones.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The use of the English language is appropriate throughout the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The researcher should review the methodology to ensure that data gathering and analysis are well-directed toward the satisfaction of the paper's aim.	

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:	Nolan Severino R. Jusayan
Department, University & Country	De La Salle Medical and Health Sciences Institute, Philippines