

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_113656
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the correlation between English spoken fluency and the capacity of working memory in both dialogic and monologic presentations.
Type of the Article	Research

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. It has analysed fluency of English and the working memory. This is significant as alternative methods of teaching English is employed in most of the language classes.</p> <p>Suitable.</p> <p>Yes it is. However the following suggestions may be attended to. Spacing between two words and punctuations need to be corrected. Grammar usage like passive form has to be used appropriately. (line 14)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references may be included. Some of the references are mentioned only in the paper and not in the reference section and vice versa.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes. But a fewer changes may be made</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The flow of thought throughout the paper is impressive and the analysis has been done well. Explanation of ideas are unambiguous though there are a few repetition of ideas. Introduction, discussion and conclusion – methodology is done effectively.</p> <p>Key words Not included – six to eight key words may be included reflecting the crux of the paper.</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:	G. Alamelu
Department, University & Country	Rajalakshmi Engineering College, India