Manuscript: **"The Impact Of The Question-Driven Technique On Developing Efl Jordanian Seventh Graders' Grammatical Competence"**

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ahmad Al-Zawahrah

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Grazia Angeloni, University "G. d'Annunzio" Chieti-Pescara - Italy

Reviewer 2: Dorjana Klosi, University Of Vlore "Ismail Qemali", Albania

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: Grazia Angeloni	
University/Country:University "G. d'Annunzio" Chieti-Pescara - Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: May 5th, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: May, 6th, 2021
Manuscript Title: THE IMPACT OF THE QUESTION-DRIVEN TECHNIQUE ON DEVELOPING EFL JORDANIAN SEVENTH GRADERS' GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 2.11.05.2021	
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 and its content adequately clarify the hypotheses and the reason for the research	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

the abstract clearly summarizes the reason for the research with its results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
the language used is appropriate and effective	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
the methodology used is explained correctly also through its fundamental theoretical references	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
the research findings are clear. what is placed in the appendix could be included in the part relating to the discussion, to support the results of what is hypothesized	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
This part could be expanded	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
in line with the authors cited	

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 suggestions expressed in each field