Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJL2C_55707**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Syllabus of an Undergraduate Language Course: A Critical Review on a Non-government University ESL Syllabus**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	- The title is long and repeated. It is better to keep only the second part of it "**A Critical Review on a Non-government University ESL Syllabus"** - **The method of the analysis should be included in the abstract.** - **No use of the third person pronoun "I"; instead use the "researcher" or use the passive voice. This should be corrected throughout the paper.** - **Methods of selecting the participants are missing. Why and how did the researcher chose his/her participants?** - **The conclusion is very short and incomprehensive of the research findings. Some implications for practitioners in the same context or future researchers.**	- Thank you for those well-reviewed comments. I have reviewed the paper and tried to the best of my ability to make the corrections. - Previously, the conclusion might seem incomprehensive due to the absence of a complete Result and Description section. As now a complete Result and Description section has been added, I believe those imperfections will be rectified now.
Minor REVISION comments	- The keywords should include only major words and it is better to be 4-5 words. - It is better to replace ELT in keywords with ESL. - Some subtitles are too long (e.g. **A list of capacities (purposes) sorted and sequenced, as, days or weeks, across particular time frames). It is better to be shorten** - **For the data analysis section of the questionnaire responses, it is better if data were placed in a table with frequencies (descriptive analysis).** - **The words "subcategory and subgroup" are confusing. Do you mean domains and items??**	- All the possible corrections are made as asked for.Still, there may have minor inappropriateness. - It is really difficult to reshape the whole data analysis sections or to show it in another way. My humble request in that matter is if you (editorial board) think that some minor changes in word/phrase are required, I believe you have the freedom to do so. - It is hoped now that the paper will be worthy of being published within the current issue.
Optional/General comments	- The article should be revised for its language structures (e.g. use of prepositions and phrasal verbs), punctuations as it is too simple and in some cases non-academic. - No introduction should introduce the methods section. There is a lot of unnecessary and minor titles that is better to be merged into bigger ones.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	