



Paper: “Attitudes of EFL Learners in Kuwait Toward Project-Based Approach”

Submitted: 04 December 2024

Accepted: 13 January 2025

Published: 31 January 2025

Corresponding Author: Aishah Alobaidan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n2p24

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Inayatullah Kakepoto
QUAID-E-AWAM University, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Saltanat Meiramova
S.Seifullin AgroTechnical University, Kazakhstan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Inayatullah Kakepoto	
University/Country: Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 07-12-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-12-2024
Manuscript Title: Examining the Attitudes of Female EFL Learners at the College of Basic Education in Kuwait Towards Integrating the Project-Based Approach in EFL Courses.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1237/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
Title of paper is too long which needs precision to attract attention of readers towards actual aim and objective of this research as investigated by authors.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
Abstract presents detailed picture of this research highlighting required information to be provided in the abstract of any research.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	

1. I have noticed few grammatical mistakes in the manuscript which need proper rectification to make this research robust.	
2. There is use of needless use words which are burden on the text. They need to be focused and removed making this piece of research complete and compact.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
1. The Methodology section needs sound revision. The information provided regarding Methodology needs proper alignment of various paras to maintain rhythm of this research.	
2. The information placed regarding research methods employed need precision to capture readers mind and interest.	
3. This section is full of redundancies which can create embarrassment for the readers.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
Results need to be summarized using minimum number of words following form and format of Academic Writing providing exact information to readers.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Conclusion section is all fine as per my view point.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
They are comprehensive and appropriate in given form and format.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Title of paper is too long which needs precision.
2. Grammatical mistakes need to be rectified and redundancies needs to be removed to make this research complete and compact.
3. The Methodology section needs proper alignment to maintain rhythm of this research.
4. The information provided regarding research tools and techniques employed need precision.
5. Use of redundancies in Methodology section create embarrassment hence; be removed.
6. Results be summarized using minimum number of words following Academic Writing style.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Reviewer Name: Saltanat Meiramova	
University/Country: A.K.Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities Institute, Kazakhstan	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.12.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.12.2024
Manuscript Title: Attitudes of EFL Learners in Kuwait Toward Project-Based Approach	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 37.12.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: ok	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: ok	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: ok	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the title of the article is clear and appropriate to the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article’s object is to examine the attitudes of female EFL learners in the College of Basic Education in Kuwait toward the integration of project-based learning (PBL) in their English courses. The methods are presented by using a questionnaire and the student-centered method to collect quantitative data. The results are expected to enhance the 21st-century skills among the graduates of its institutions and prepare them to be active and productive in their future careers.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, there are some but not impact significantly on the comprehension of the article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the results are described in details, the participants' number are appropriate to get the reliable data to form new attitudes and perceptions about the method used and its effectiveness for English learning.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> n/a	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is quite precise and clear and confirm the provided results and aim.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the reference includes 29 resources which are appropriate to the topic of the article.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: It could be accepted.