

**Paper: “Screencast Video Feedback and its Implication on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing”**

**Submitted: 21 July 2021**

**Accepted: 01 September 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Nato Pachuashvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p66](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p66)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Barbara Cappuzzo  
University of Palermo, Italy

Reviewer 3: Blinded

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The title is adequate to the content of the paper.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract is clear and complete.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

(Please insert your comments)

The article shows a few grammatical errors. Linguistic revision is suggested.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The methods are explained clearly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the article is very clear but contains a few errors, mostly of punctuation.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The references are exhaustive and appropriate to the content of the article.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

### **Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

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

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

The article is very well structured and the content is supported by a solid bibliographical background. There are some grammatical and punctuation errors. Linguistic revision is recommended.

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