

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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. 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 (not perceived the impact). 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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: December 4 th , 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: December 13 th , 2017
Manuscript Title: HUMANISTIC APPROACHIN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGE (FROM THE TEACHER PERSPECTIVE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint 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.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> It needs particular specification on the region or the target group it is conveyed.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Yes, a good summary of the main points discussed in the body of the paper in regards to attitudes and influences in the EFL process.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Yes, there are few spelling mistakes but not grammatical. The syntax seems fine.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Yes, as the author states, the data can not be generalized since only 6 in depth interviews were conveyed and that does not represent a generalization.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> Few typographical errors but are not affecting the understanding from the readers.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i> It reflects students understanding from several angles which does not measure only their academic success but intellectual achievement as well.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanationis recommendable)</i> <i>Yes, most of the references are comprehensive.</i>	

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):

There are a number of typographical mistakes which are not in syntax and do not change the context but need to be polished. The topic is important in order to develop a more humanistic approach in the EFL teaching context.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I suggest this paper to be published after some polishing is processed from the candidate.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

