



**Paper: “Explorations of Beliefs about EFL Teachers’ Roles from Both Teachers’ and Students’ Perspectives through Metaphor Analysis”**

**Submitted: 13 August 2020**

**Accepted: 13 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Sharihan Azeez

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p205](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p205)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Haggag Mohamed Haggag  
South Valley University, Egypt

**Reviewer 2:** 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: <i>Haggag Mohamed Haggag</i>	
University/Country: <i>South Valley University - Egypt</i>	
Date Manuscript Received: <i>Aug 17th</i>	Date Review Report Submitted: <i>Aug 21 th</i>
Manuscript Title: <i>Explorations of Beliefs about EFL Teachers' Roles from Both Teachers' and Students' Perspectives through Metaphor Analysis</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <i>0893/20</i>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The title should clearly reflect the research variables; I would recommend the following title:  "Using Metaphor Analysis in assessing Beliefs about EFL Teachers' Roles from Both Teachers' and Students' Perspectives"</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Although the abstract is comprehensive but it lacks the description of design and methodology.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>A language revision is recommended since there are some errors such as contractions “e.g. didn’t”, verb tense agreement “e.g. she give” and structure errors “e.g. make us be fluent”.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Both data collection and analysis parts need careful revision; participants’ adjustment is not recorded.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Literature review is not coherent; it lacks further studies about EFL beliefs and the variables of the research. A deeper literature review is recommended with a focus on EFL area from both local and international perspectives.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The paper lacks quantitative data, no percents were provided; there should be percents about the variables from one side and further details about questionnaire adjustment (validity and reliability) is recommended as well.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>APA style guide should be followed since there are critical citation errors in books and journals citations as well as on-line resources.</i>	

**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):**

- *Language revision is recommended.*
- *APA style should be followed in both in-text and referencing.*
- *Deeper literature review is recommended to be included.*
- *More quantitative data is recommended to be included.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

- *Language revision is recommended.*

# ***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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 15.09.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.09.2020
Manuscript Title: Explorations of Beliefs about EFL Teachers' Roles from Both Teachers' and Students' Perspectives through Metaphor Analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 93.08.2020	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
The title is too long and does not summarise very clearly the content of the article, although it makes clear its objectives. I suggest finding a shorter title, like: Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about EFL Teachers through Metaphor Analysis	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
The abstract is clear, concise and engaging. The author clearly presented the	

objectives, the methods and the anticipated results.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The reviewer did not find any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes (one grammar mistake /agreement/ is corrected directly in the manuscript by the reviewer).	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
The study methods are clearly explained and described. The author(authors) connects the topic and the methods with the literature and with the purpose of his/her research work.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The body of the article is clear and does not contain errors. But I do have one format suggestion, though: there should be more paragraphs in the introduction (not just one) that would make the literature review more clearly organised.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions provide relevant feedback on the presentation and analysis of the data discussed in the paper, and most importantly point to the importance of such methods in assessing students'/teachers' beliefs in a student-centered educational process.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
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	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

No comments.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

No comments.