
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 team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|---|---|
| Date Manuscript Received: 26 Dec. 2018 | Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 5 Jan. 2018 |
| Manuscript Title: ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION ERRORS MADE BY SAUDI STUDENTS | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0125/18 | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | 5 |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | 5 |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> There are some language (especially verb) mistakes that must be corrected before publication. | 3.5 |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</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):

This is a well-researched paper that is well presented and effectively organized. The author interacts effectively with previous research on this topic, which she applies well to her own research study. There are some language (especially verb) mistakes that need to be corrected before publication. Perhaps, the author can elaborate on how to remedy these types of errors (made by Saudi students) by providing a more detailed scheme. The author does make some suggestions in the conclusion, but this part needs to be expanded.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I believe that this paper can be published after the author makes the required

corrections and additions.

