



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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"</li> <li>- The method of the analysis should be included in the abstract.</li> <li>- No use of the third person pronoun "I"; instead use the "researcher" or use the passive voice. This should be corrected throughout the paper.</li> <li>- Methods of selecting the participants are missing. Why and how did the researcher chose his/her participants?</li> <li>- The conclusion is very short and incomprehensive of the research findings. Some implications for practitioners in the same context or future researchers.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The keywords should include only major words and it is better to be 4-5 words.</li> <li>- It is better to replace ELT in keywords with ESL.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- For the data analysis section of the questionnaire responses, it is better if data were placed in a table with frequencies (descriptive analysis).</li> <li>- The words "subcategory and subgroup" are confusing. Do you mean domains and items??</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amira Ali
Department, University & Country	Sadat Academy for Management Sciences, Egypt