

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117705
Title of the Manuscript:	A Descriptive-Correlational Study on the Relationship between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension of Elementary Pupils
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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <p>This manuscript tackles a significant issue in education, focusing on the relationship between English proficiency and reading comprehension among elementary pupils. Considering the global emphasis on English as the primary language of instruction and its influence on academic achievement, this research holds substantial value for educators, policymakers, and scholars interested in language acquisition and educational outcomes. By exploring this relationship within the context of Filipino students, the study enhances the understanding of language proficiency challenges in countries where English is not the native language.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Is the title of the article suitable? <p>The current title is clear and descriptive, but it could be more precise. A suggested alternative title is: Exploring the Correlation between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension among Elementary Pupils in the Philippines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? <p>The abstract effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, it would benefit from an earlier mention of the sample size and a clearer statement on the significance of the results.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? <p>The manuscript is generally well-organized with clear sections such as the introduction, methods, results, and conclusion. However, the results section would benefit from clearer subsections to improve readability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <p>The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, employing appropriate research design and methodology. The use of validated questionnaires to measure English proficiency and reading comprehension is suitable. The statistical analysis methods are correctly applied to address the research questions. However, the study's limited sample size and focus on a single school may restrict the generalizability of the findings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form <p>The references cited are relevant but should include more recent studies to provide a contemporary perspective. Many sources are outdated, and incorporating newer research would strengthen the manuscript. Balancing foundational studies with recent research is essential. Examples of recent references include: Lee, S., & Kim, Y. (2021). Extensive reading and vocabulary proficiency. Lawrence, J. F. (2019). Vocabulary's role in reading comprehension.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>The language quality of the article is generally appropriate for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, the sentences are well-structured, and the terminology is suitable for an academic audience. However, there are some areas where minor improvements can be made for clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>Correction 1:</p> <p>Original: "A Descriptive-Correlational Study on the Relationship between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension of Elementary Pupils" Suggested: "A Descriptive-Correlational Study on the Relationship Between English Proficiency and Reading Comprehension Among Elementary Pupils"</p> <p>Correction 2:</p> <p>Original: "Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, educators and parents have sought the best way to continue formal education through a combination of both printed modular distance learning and virtual learning (Daniel, Hodges & Reich, 2020). However, most students in schools located in far-flung areas opted to utilize modules in learning, which required them to read independently." Suggested: "During the COVID-19 pandemic, educators and parents sought to continue formal education through a combination of printed modular distance learning and virtual learning (Daniel, Hodges & Reich, 2020). However, students in remote areas primarily relied on learning modules, requiring independent reading."</p> <p>Correction 3:</p> <p>Original: "The study employed a validated questionnaire, which was used to measure the respondents' English proficiency and reading comprehension." Suggested: "A validated questionnaire was used to measure the respondents' English proficiency and reading comprehension. This questionnaire included separate sections for grammar and vocabulary proficiency, as well as reading comprehension."</p> <p>Correction 4:</p> <p>Original: "The level of students' English proficiency in terms of Grammar and Vocabulary is presented in Table 2. Results showed that in terms of English proficiency, the indicator 'grammar' has a mean of 6.85 with a standard deviation of 1.81..." Suggested: "Table 2 presents the level of students' English proficiency in terms of grammar and vocabulary. The results indicate that the 'grammar' proficiency has a mean of 6.85 with a standard deviation of 1.81..."</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Ensure the questionnaire and data collection methods are thoroughly described and validated. 2. Clearly state the study's limitations, including the specific sample and its impact on the generalizability of the results. 3. Include recommendations for future research to build on the findings. However, enhancements could be made regarding sample size, ethical considerations, and a more detailed discussion of the significance and limitations of the findings.</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:	Rahmatullah Syaripuddin
Department, University & Country	Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia