

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126523
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Using Desuggestopedia Method on Yemeni Students' Ability to Understand Collocations</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The thorough approach and unambiguous results of the study have useful ramifications for language instructors, especially those who work with EFL students. Despite the limited sample size, the findings are encouraging and call for additional research in larger-scale investigations.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The study's focus is correctly reflected in the title, which is straightforward and succinct. But by emphasizing the methodology's inventiveness, it could be made more interesting: 1. Unlocking Collocation Mastery: Yemeni Learners' Potential with Desuggestopedia. 2. Going Beyond Conventional Instruction: Using Desuggestopedia to Improve Collocation Learning</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Overall, the abstract is thorough, giving a concise synopsis of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. A succinct explanation of the theoretical foundation supporting the research, such as the cognitive and affective aspects of language acquisition, could enhance it even more.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, following the standard format.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>By using a quasi-experimental approach to examine the effect of Desuggestopedia on collocation learning, the manuscript exhibits a solid foundation in research technique. The scientific rigor of the study is improved by the implementation of a valid and dependable achievement exam in conjunction with suitable statistical analysis. The study's technical soundness is further enhanced by the precise formulation of the research topic, hypotheses, and data analysis protocols. The discussion part also offers a thorough analysis of the results, backed by pertinent theoretical frameworks and empirical data.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>There is a decent mix of pertinent books and research articles in the reference list, which seems to be adequate. Although some older sources are provided to provide historical context and underlying information, the references are mostly recent. Think about adding additional recent research on Desuggestopedia's efficacy, especially when it comes to language learning, to the reference list to make it even stronger.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the article is appropriate for academic communication; nevertheless, its impact and readability might be significantly enhanced by a professional editor or native English speaker performing a comprehensive language edit.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>More detailed information regarding the application of the Desuggestopedia approaches will improve the methodology section. This would enable a more accurate assessment of the effect of the treatment. Furthermore, taking into account the usage of comparison or control groups could improve the study's rigor even more.</p> <p>Although the discussion section provides a sound interpretation of the results, a more thorough examination of the theoretical ramifications would enhance it much more. The authors can offer a more thorough comprehension of the underlying mechanisms by making links between the findings and current theories of language acquisition and second language learning. It would also be beneficial to talk about the study's real-world applications in language instruction.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammad Mahdi Kazemi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Persian Gulf University of Bousheh, Iran</b>