

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 UNIVERSITY IN ZAMBIA
Type of the 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	An interesting topic that examines shell nouns in the academic writing of science undergraduate students. The paper has attempted to understand the frequency, patterns, and functions of shell nouns across different disciplines. As rightly mentioned in the abstract by the researcher, shell nouns are linguistic elements that serve to generalize, summarize, or nominalize complex processes, facilitating coherence and formal tone in academic writing. Unfortunately, the researcher has not actually carried out the analysis in the sub-section labelled 3-4 Data Analysis. The researcher needs to present shell nouns in the linguistic environments where they occur, may be through selections of sentences or clauses from students' academic writings and demonstrate how the highlighted shell nouns contribute to cohesion. This suggests that the technical linguistic analysis needs to be carried out and presented in the sub-section labelled 3-4 Data Analysis before moving to the findings in section 4. This is highly fundamental. Without the linguistic context of occurrence of the highlighted shell nouns added to their technical linguistic analysis, the relevance of the results/findings cannot be fully appreciated and consequently they cannot stand valid.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The paper actually attempts to examine the use of shell nouns in university undergraduate science students' writing in light of a combination of theories namely Schmid's shell-nounhood framework, genre theory and contrastive rhetoric. The title needs to be re-shaped in a way to stress clearly what the researcher is about to carry out as a study on the one hand and the perspective under which it is going to be dealt with on the other hand. Thus, the title may be rephrased as: Investigating the Use of Shell Nouns in University Undergraduate Science Students' Writings: A Cognitive Linguistic Case Study of Mukuba University in Zambia	

<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 needs to be further edited for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reason for the choice of the topic is missing, - The research theory is missing, - The research objective(s) are missing, - On the other hand, the author should avoid the use of simple past since the research is not yet completed. It is recommended to use either simple present or present perfect. <p>As a reminder, a good abstract necessarily includes the key points such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reason(s) for the choice of the topic, - The research objective(s), - The research theory, - The research method(s) - The main findings. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are not quite appropriate. As illustrations, the researcher has presented after section 6 labelled 6. Conclusion, sections 7 and 8 labelled respectively 7 Limitations of the Study, 8 Recommendations. Actually, there should be no other section or subsection after the conclusion.</p> <p>As a reminder, a good conclusion necessarily includes the key points such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A restated thesis, - A summary of the key findings, - Closing sentence(s) - Perspective for future research. <p>Based on these observations, the whole conclusion should be reconsidered and further edited. In the same way, the introduction should be reconsidered and further edited. Actually, a good introduction consists of key elements namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a relevant preamble (that is missing in this work), - problem statement, - a thesis statement (that is missing in this work), - a brief account of the theory (that is missing in this work), - the objectives, - the research questions, - the hypotheses (that is missing in this work), - the planning (that is missing in this work), <p>So, the researcher is invited to further edit the introduction following the observations above. As the researcher has framed 3 research questions, he/she should necessarily frame 3 hypotheses.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically correct as it stresses specific issues in light of a combination of relevant theories. But it is not scientifically robust because the results/findings have been presented without any linguistic analysis.</p>	

robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript does not sound technically robust because the data have not been technically and linguistically analysed. The researcher needs to present shell nouns in the linguistic environments where they occur, may be through selections of sentences or clauses from students' academic writings and demonstrate how the highlighted shell nouns contribute to cohesion. Suggestion of demonstration required: The researcher should provide a selection of sentences or clauses from students' writing and highlight in bold shell nouns, in <i>italics</i> the idea the shell nouns relate to, and determine the shell-content-complex of each selected sentence for illustration before stressing their semantic function, cognitive function as well as textual function.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes, it is.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The researcher needs to further edit the introduction, the data analysis, the conclusion.	

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:	Servais Dieu-Donné Yédia Dadjó
Department, University & Country	University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin