

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_128582
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTRODUCTION FORMATS IN ESSAY WRITING: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The importance of this manuscript is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It contributes to writing pedagogy by providing valuable insights into effective introduction formats. ii. It supports the advancement of academic communication and writing pedagogy practices. iii. It offers novelty by uniquely comparing five introduction <u>formats</u> through a systematic review. iv. It highlights the relevance of diverse introduction styles for various academic disciplines, ensuring practical applications. v. It benefits educators teaching academic writing and students looking to improve their writing skills; however, the participant sample data used in the analysis must be clearly declared. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title is relevant to the manuscript's content but needs to be restructured for better alignment with the methodology and focus. An alternative title could be: "A Systematic Review of Introduction Approaches in Essay Writing Studies: A Comparative Analysis."</p> <p>Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This alternative aligns better with the focus of the manuscript, as the terms "approaches" and "studies" more accurately reflect the study's emphasis, helping to prevent confusion for readers. However, the author should identify the original sources or frameworks where these approaches were first introduced, including when and within which theoretical context they were conceptualized. ii. My suggestion for the manuscript title is to use the term "approaches" instead of "formats," "types," or "forms," as it better reflects the conceptual and analytical focus of the manuscript. The term "approaches" emphasizes the strategies used to craft introductions, rather than their structural layout. If the terminology is not consistently applied, the manuscript's methodology and structure may become misaligned, potentially requiring significant restructuring. 	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, summarizing the purpose, methodology, key findings, and implications of the study. However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it still lacks mention of the study's limitations, such as the reliance on English-language sources and limited cultural diversity. - Specific findings should also be included. For instance, highlighting the ranking of introduction <u>formats</u>' effectiveness across disciplines, from the most to the least preferred <u>formats</u>. While each approach has its primary role depending on the genre and writing style, and the best way to introduce a topic varies by discourse, it is still crucial to identify which approach is most used in essay writing across various disciplines. - The abstract should also emphasize its practical implications, particularly for educators or students, by specifically mentioning the target participants of the essay writing research included in this manuscript, such as university students or other relevant groups. - To improve clarity, redundant statements should be avoided, and background information condensed to focus on the study's unique contributions. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound as it effectively addresses the research questions, employs a systematic review methodology, and provides clear findings with practical implications. However, it requires greater clarity in its methodology, particularly in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly explain how the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) works and provide a rationale for using the MMAT to assess the quality of data in essay writing studies. - State the total MMAT score and explain the contradiction between selecting 45 studies for the final analysis and including only six references in the results (excluding duplicate data). - Specify how many articles were included in the final analysis and categorize them according to qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method approaches. - Cite the MMAT source and provide examples of two or three systematic reviews that employed the same method. This would strengthen the rationale for using MMAT, as it is not widely recognized in systematic review methodologies. - Clearly specify the target participants in the data analysis, such as university students or other groups, to better contextualize the study's practical implications. <p>Additionally, the study's reliance on English-language sources and Western perspectives limits its cultural inclusivity and generalizability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors should consider including studies from non-Western contexts or discussing how cultural and linguistic norms influence writing styles to make the findings more globally relevant. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a good mix of primary sources. However, several improvements are needed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Some in-text citations are missing from the reference list, which does not comply with the journal's guidelines. ii. There are repeated references that should be removed to maintain accuracy and professionalism. iii. While the references prioritize primary sources, including more recent and impactful journal articles would enhance the study's relevance and credibility. Incorporating references from diverse cultural and linguistic contexts would broaden the manuscript's applicability. <p>Solutions: To address these issues, the author should carefully cross-check all in-text citations against the reference list, remove duplicates, and ensure all references are formatted according to the journal's requirements.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, with an appropriate academic tone and use of technical terminology. However, there are minor issues with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Grammar, such as subject-verb agreement. ii. Overly complex sentences <p>Solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Simplifying sentences and ensuring consistency in terms and tone ii. A professional proofreading review is recommended. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please state or use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical issue and problem statement Clearly state the critical issue and problem statement to highlight the need and motivation for this research in the introduction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The issue and problem statement should align with the results and data analysis, focusing specifically on introduction types, formats, or forms. It is important to select one term consistently throughout the manuscript to maintain clarity and readability. Using multiple terms interchangeably (e.g., "types," "formats," or "forms") could confuse readers by implying different meanings or approaches. - Additionally, the issue and problem statement should address challenges across various disciplines, emphasizing the complexities involved in constructing introduction paragraphs in different fields. The author should also state the motivation behind conducting a review paper on introduction formats, types, or approaches, linking this motivation to the broader significance of the research. This flow of writing will help create coherence between the introduction and the literature review, ensuring a logical and unified flow throughout the manuscript. 2. Consistency in Terminology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is suggested to use the term "approach" to replace terms like "format," "type," or "form." - If this term is adopted, ensure it is used consistently throughout the manuscript, particularly in the research question and Boolean operator terms. Avoid using synonyms such as "introduction type" or "introduction form." Consistency in terminology is essential to maintain clarity in the writing. 3. Literature review writing style. The literature review should begin and include the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Broad Discussion: Start by outlining general challenges and trends in academic writing to provide context for the discussion. ii. Review Existing Studies: Discuss studies that explore various approaches and methods for improving essay introductions. iii. Identify Unexplored Areas: Highlight gaps in the existing research, such as underutilized methods or unexamined disciplinary or cultural variations. iv. Incorporate Theoretical Frameworks: Refer to key theories or insights from prominent scholars to establish a solid foundation. v. Emphasize the Gap: Clearly state what remains unexplored or underdeveloped in the literature. vi. Conclude with the Study's Contribution: Explain how the current study addresses the identified gap and contributes novel insights to the field. <p>Word Count and Total of Citations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The manuscript does not meet the journal's guidelines for word count. The required length is 5,000–9,000 words, including references, whereas this manuscript only has 4,460 words (as 	

Review Form 3

	per MS Word's word count). The author must expand the content to meet the minimum word count requirement.	
--	---	--

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:	Wan Nur Aida Sakinah Wan Jusoh
Department, University & Country	Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia