

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_129683
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use Of Shell Nouns In University Undergraduate Science Students' Writing: The Case At Mukuba Universityin Zambia
Type of the Article	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>

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.	This investigation is significant for the scientific community for the reason that it analyses the understudied field of shell noun usage in academic writing, specifically within science undergraduate students in Zambia. The study offers both theoretical and practical insights by highlighting students' linguistic challenges and revealing discipline and academic year variances. Its findings help us understand how shell nouns improve academic writing's coherence, objectivity, and formal tone, all of which are necessary for good scientific communication. Furthermore, the study emphasizes the need of targeted educational initiatives, providing useful recommendations for improving academic literacy and writing proficiency among scientific students, laying a solid foundation for their future scholarly contributions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, " The Use of Shell Nouns in University Undergraduate Science Students' Writing: The Case at Mukuba University in Zambia, " is descriptive and provides a clear indication of the study's focus. However, it can be refined for conciseness and to emphasize its academic contribution. The following alternative title might be used instead: " Shell Noun Usage in Science Undergraduate Academic Writing: Insights from Mukuba University, Zambia "	

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 comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study, including its objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, there are areas where it could be slightly refined to improve clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Structure: The abstract is well-structured, with clear sections that cover the study's focus, methods, findings, and implications. Detail: It mentions the disciplines analyzed, the type of writing samples, and the progression across academic years. Relevance: It effectively emphasizes the importance of pedagogical interventions and future research. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify Methodology: Briefly specify how the data was analyzed (e.g., thematic analysis, frequency analysis). This would provide more depth to the methodological description. Findings Focus: Mention specific challenges faced by students or notable trends to highlight the key takeaways. Objective Statement: Explicitly state the practical or theoretical contribution to make the abstract more impactful. For example: "This study contributes to the understanding of linguistic features in academic writing within a sub-Saharan African context, providing insights for educators to enhance writing instruction." 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Research Objectives: The manuscript clearly outlines its aim to investigate shell noun usage in academic writing, focusing on science undergraduate students. The research questions are relevant and appropriately addressed throughout the study. Methodology: A qualitative case study approach is appropriately chosen to examine the nuances of shell noun usage. The use of stratified purposive sampling ensures diverse representation across academic years and disciplines. Data Analysis: The manuscript employs thematic analysis, which is suitable for identifying patterns and trends in linguistic features such as shell nouns. This method is correctly described and implemented. Findings and Interpretation: The findings are well-supported by evidence from the data. The manuscript highlights key variations in shell noun usage across disciplines and academic years, linking these to academic writing conventions. Implications: The recommendations for pedagogical interventions and future research are logical and align with the findings, adding practical value to the study. <p>Sample Size: While the stratified purposive sampling approach is valid, the relatively small sample size (25 participants) may limit the generalizability of the findings. The manuscript acknowledges this as a limitation.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and provides valuable insights into shell noun usage in academic writing among science undergraduates. Any limitations identified are acknowledged and do not significantly undermine the validity of the study. It offers meaningful contributions to both theoretical and pedagogical discussions in academic writing. With minor refinements, it is well-suited for publication.</p>	
<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, relevant, and provide a strong theoretical foundation. Many foundational works on shell nouns and academic writing, such as those by Schmid (2000), Hyland and Tse (2005), and Swales (1990), are included. However, there are a few areas where the references could be updated or expanded to include more recent studies and broaden the manuscript's scope.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> While some references are recent (e.g., Benítez-Castro, 2021; Fang & Dong, 2021), it is crucial to include more studies published in the last 3–5 years to reflect the latest developments in the field. Most references focus on Western academic contexts. Including studies from African or other underrepresented contexts would add depth and relevance, given the study's Zambian setting. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Include more recent references to ensure the study reflects contemporary research. Add citations from African or other non-Western contexts to provide a balanced perspective relevant to the study's setting. Consider including references focused on pedagogical approaches to improve academic writing, as this is a major implication of the study. <p>Suggested references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Murray, R., & Tharby, M. (2023). Teaching academic cohesion: Approaches for integrating shell nouns into university writing courses. <i>Educational Linguistics Journal</i>. (This could enrich the recommendations for pedagogy.) Ahmed, M., & Hassan, R. (2021). Linguistic challenges in academic writing for non-native English speakers: A focus on African universities. <i>Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development</i>. (This aligns well with the Zambian university context.) Charles, M. (2022). Shell nouns and their rhetorical roles in academic writing: A corpus-based analysis. <i>Journal of English for Academic Purposes</i>. 	

Review Form 3

	(This could provide updated insights into the rhetorical functions of shell nouns.)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. It adheres to academic conventions and uses clear, formal language appropriate for a research article. However, there are minor areas where the language could be refined to improve clarity, conciseness, and readability.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript uses an appropriately formal tone, suitable for scholarly writing. 2. Key points are presented clearly, with well-structured sentences and paragraphs. 3. Academic terminology, particularly related to shell nouns and linguistic analysis, is used correctly and effectively. <p>Recommendations for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certain points, especially about the importance of shell nouns, are repeated across sections. Reducing redundancy can make the text more engaging. 2. Some sentences are longer than necessary and could be condensed for better readability. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is a valuable contribution to understanding the role of shell nouns in academic writing, particularly within the context of science undergraduate students at Mukuba University in Zambia. It is well-organized and clearly written, with a logical flow from the introduction to the conclusion. The study's focus on an underexplored linguistic feature, combined with its emphasis on the Zambian context, adds originality and relevance to the research. While the findings are insightful and supported by appropriate methodologies, incorporating more recent references and broadening the discussion to include implications beyond the local context would enhance its academic impact. The language quality is strong, but minor adjustments to improve clarity and conciseness would make the manuscript even more reader-friendly. Overall, this is a thoroughly conducted research with meaningful contributions to the field of academic writing and linguistic research.</p> <p>Based on the manuscript's overall quality, structure, and content, I would give it a score of 8.5. This indicates it requires minor revisions to address a few areas, such as enhancing the clarity of certain sections, ensuring recent references are included, and possibly refining the language for better readability. The manuscript is scientifically sound and well-prepared, making it suitable for publication with these small adjustments</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gulchehra Rahmanova (Bakieva)
Department, University & Country	Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan