Paper: **"Teachers' Perceptions about Language Learning Difficulties in English as a Foreign Language EFL Classes"**

Corresponding Author: Haggag Mohamed Haggag

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sufi Amin
International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Vanya Katsarska
Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria

Reviewer 3: Larisa Topka
Irkutsk State University, Russia

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

Reviewer Name: Larisa V. Topka	
University/Country: Irkutsk State University / Russia	
Date Manuscript Received: 25.04.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04.05.2020
Manuscript Title: Teachers' Perceptions about Language Learning Difficulties in English as a Foreign Language EFL Classes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.04.2020	
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 is clear and adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
The objects and results are clearly presented in the abstract but methods are not presented clearly. Key terms are not exactly adequate to the content of the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
The language of the paper is grammatically correct. No mistakes or misprints are found. However, the line spacing is not unified; there some extra spaces between words in the text and extra punctuation marks (commas) where they are not necessary. The paragraphs' titles also need to be unified in size of the font (using colons or not).	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The study methods are quite explicit.	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Unfortunately, not all the sources in the list of references are cited in the content (Okanlawon, A. E. (2017). The text format of the list of references (paragraph format) must be in full justification (width format).	

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 study methods must be clearly presented in the abstract. All the sources in the list of references should be cited in the content of the paper, and the text format of the list of references (paragraph format) must be in full justification (width format).

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: Sufi Amin	Email:
University/Country: International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 10-04-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12-04-2020
Manuscript Title: **Teachers' Perceptions about Language Learning Difficulties in English as a Foreign Language EFL Classes**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0467/20	
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**
The title of the paper is clear and adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The research objectives/methods/result is significant and well framed. The researcher has designed it very well, conducted researcher in proper way and the	

thesis has due weightage	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
The write-up needs careful editing in terms of linguistic and format aspects.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
The research method needs elaboration.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
The length of the paper is very big. It is recommended that to reduce the length of the paper up to 15 pages.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Conclusions should be based on findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
In some reference are not according to APA format. It is recommended that to follow APA format in references.	

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):

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: Vanya Katsarska	
University/Country: Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.04.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26.04.2020
Manuscript Title: Teachers' Perceptions about Language Learning Difficulties in English as a Foreign Language EFL Classes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 67.04.2020	
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 manuscript properly reflects its content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

The abstract provides good summary of the paper. It's easy to read and accurately summarizes the goal, methods and results of the research.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
One can notice a couple of minor structure and grammar errors. There are a few punctuation errors which can easily be eliminated.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Methods are replicable and well-grounded.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
The manuscript provides some research related to the topic of DL. It sets out the argument well and highlights the discrepancies between previous research results of other scholars and the current research findings. There is enough data, both quantitative and qualitative, to support the argument and give answers to the research questions.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The key message is clear. The implications – relevant.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Good references.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Proofreading is recommended to ensure consistency and accuracy in punctuation and grammar.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: