ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.
You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 17.01.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 21.01.2018
Manuscript Title: **ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION ERRORS MADE BY SAUDI STUDENTS**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and truly excellent. It is straight to the point of the content of the article. The topic of the article is very urgent. It goes without saying that English pronunciation is a rather problematic issue. It is noteworthy that sometimes even native speakers do not pronounce English words properly, not to say anything about people who study English as the second language.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(An explanation is recommendable) The abstract meets all essential criteria. It succinctly and concisely but exhaustively renders what the article is about. While reading the abstract, a reader already realizes the basic issues that are described in the article in details.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
(a brief explanation is recommendable) There are some grammatical, lexical, punctuation mistakes, but I have already edited the text.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

(An explanation is recommendable)	
Excellent. The most impressive thing is that the study method was carried out through a true experimental research.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**

(An explanation is recommendable)

The architectonics of the paper is outstanding. Each part is logically linked with another. I especially like that the author focuses on the causes of error in pronunciation. The paper includes all necessary components and meets the set criteria.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**

(An explanation is recommendable)

In the conclusion, the author briefly but clearly discusses what the findings of the study reveal and even gives recommendations how to cope with this problem.

7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)*	**4**

The bibliography is really very rich. It comprises contemporary researches as well as older ones. I suggest it would be better if the references were listed in alphabetic order.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think you have to continue the research in this field to introduce more and more interesting issues to the audience and find out more solutions how to cope with this rather crucial problem.

Please, correct the text according to the given comments.
Please, list the references in alphabetic order.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The author has to make corrections in the text according to the comments given in the text. Track changes

have already been made. I suggest the author should list the references in alphabetic order.

Such interesting papers should be published in order readers to get acquainted with different kinds of errors in English pronunciation and avoid the same mistakes.