Paper: **"Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course"**

Corresponding Author: Nawal Nabih Ayoub

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adil Jamil
Amman University, Jordan

Reviewer 2: Mubarak Alkhatnai
King Saud University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 3: Jeromil O. Enoc
Cebu Normal University, Philippines

Reviewer 4: Berivan M. Ahmed Abdullah
University of Zakho, Kurdistan Region of Iraq

Reviewer 5: Mohamed El Kandoussi
Moulay Ismail University (UMI), Morocco

Reviewer 6: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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.
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: Dr. Mubarak Alkhatnai	
University/Country: King Saud University, Saudi Arabia	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/4/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/4/20
Manuscript Title: **Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is a good effort behind the paper. However I believe the manuscript needs to be substantially improved before it can be accepted. The need for such research should be established and the justification of the methodology used should be clearly explained. Lastly, the paper needs to be edited and proofread for some language issues. Some of which were clearly marked.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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.
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: *Jeromil O. Enoc*	Email:
University/Country:*Cebu Normal University/Philippines*	
Date Manuscript Received: April 18,2020	Date Review Report Submitted: April 26,2020
Manuscript Title: *Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course*	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0494/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **Yes**/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:**Yes**/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:**Yes**/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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 well-crafted. It captures what the study is all about.*	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
• *The abstract contains the summary of the paper. It may include a recommendation.*	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
• *Ethical considerations may be included.* • *Instruments validation may be included, too.*	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is timely and relevant.
Learning logs can be well integrated in other online-learning platforms.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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. *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: Berivan M. Ahmed Abdullah	
University/Country: University of Zakho/ Kurdistan Region of Iraq	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/04/2020
Manuscript Title: **Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 94.04.2020	
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: Yes 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.

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 of the research is very clear and adequate to the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract states the aim, methods and findings of the research clearly.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The used language is very clear and understandable.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methodology section is very well organized, clear, and understandable.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
The structure of the research is well organized and a good number of headings and subheadings are used, which makes it easy to follow.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusion is accurate and understandable.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Some of the references are old, however they are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please read the research paper as I wrote ALL my notes and corrections in details there.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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.
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: **Mohamed EL KANDOUSSI**	
University/Country: Moulay Ismail university (UMI) Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:16/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/05/2020
Manuscript Title: **Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0491/20**	
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: Yes 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Generally speaking, the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article, though the phrase 'Learning Logs' needs to be embedded inside the title.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The abstract is concise, relevant and clear. It also outlines and the main results of the research. A word, however, on the major recommendations of the study needs to be included.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
The text is generally accurate and lucid with very few minor grammar, spelling, punctuation and diction errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The adopted methodology has made the work clearer and well-founded. The sections, however, about methodology should be more organized and should stand together and need not be loosely interlinked. Also, the author needs to spell out more clearly and scientifically the research hypothesis and the research question which does not seem any different.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
The body is generally coherent and empirically substantiated through accurate findings in terms of statistical results.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The conclusion needs to be enriched with more substantial and detailed recommendations for the stake holders.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The extensive reference list demonstrates that this is a thoroughly researched and well-documented study.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article is an in-depth and timely investigation of an interesting and significant pedagogical issue. It is generally well-structured and documented. The language is generally accurate. Very few errors pertaining to grammar, mechanics and diction still need to be reviewed and corrected.

It is thus worth-sharing amongst the research community.

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

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.
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: 24.04.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.05.2020
Manuscript Title: Learning Logs: The Effect of Incorporating Write-to-Learn Assignments on Promoting Learning and Retention of Information in a Phonology Course	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 94.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No 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.

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 very clear and one can easily link it to the content of the article and to its objectives.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The abstract is clear, concise and engaging. The author clearly presented the objectives, the methods and the anticipated results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**

The reviewer did not find any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The study methods are clearly explained and described. The author connects the topic and the methods with the literature and with the purpose of her research work.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
The body of the article is clear and does not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions provide relevant feedback on the presentation and analysis of the data discussed in the paper, and most importantly point to the the sustainability and reproducibility of the methodology used (writing logs, as a form of WTL assignments, could be employed in different types of activities related to FL teaching/learning).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
All the bibliographic sources used for the elaboration of this article are appropriate and up-to-date.	

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):

I really found this article quite interesting, but not necessarily for its quantitative research or its outcomes. It was the method employed and the varied types of tasks proposed by the author that made me realise the usefulness of using logs in any aspect of FL teaching or learning (not only to facilitate learning, but also to help acquire the metalanguage).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments.