

**Paper: “The Effect of Data-Driven Learning of Grammar on Georgian EFL University Students’ Grammar Achievement”**

**Submitted: 06 August 2021**

**Accepted: 23 August 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Nino Tsulaia

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p168](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p168)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Haggag Mohamed Haggag  
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Hamad H. Alsowat  
Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 3: Ahmad AL-Zawahrah  
Ministry of Education, Ajloun, Jordan

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)*

It is recommended to change the title:

THE EFFECT OF DATA-DRIVEN ON GEORGIAN EFL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS'  
GRAMMAR LEARNING

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

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

45 EFL learners or 44?

The abstract should be revised.

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are many grammatical and punctuation errors; proofreading is needed.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The methods are not explained clearly.

The researcher should clarify:

The design of the study.

The research tools and how they were built and verified (validity and reliability).

The procedures of gathering and analyzing data.

The results through clear tables (not copying SPSS outputs).

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The discussion was limited and inadequate. It should be rewritten to focus on the main findings of this study and compare them with previous studies' findings.

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is poor. It should include implications for teaching grammar using DDL.

**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)

Some references are too old.

There are some mistakes in documentation.

Revise this name: Chojo and Oghigian (2008)

Follow APA7 style.

***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):**

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 does not clearly identify the independent variable, I would recommend adding a word like "motivation, achievement or performance".

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

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The abstract though comprehensive but starts with data driven discussion however it should start with the aim of the research. It should also describe the approach

followed in both design and instruction of the grammar course. The abstract has no quantitative data results.

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

(Please insert your comments)

The paper is recommended for grammar and spelling revision including style; there are many short sentences that need to be combined for coherence and cohesion issues. For example "In the DDL activities, learners have the role of researchers".

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The method included many details that could be added to other sections such as introduction or literature. I would recommend moving the section "The Data-Driven Grammar Learning method" to the introduction or literature section. The methodology is clear and concise as well.

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The body is clear but has few coherence issues that require revision. Statistical issues need more justification such as the big significance differences ".757 and .004"

Names of variables should be renamed "VAR00001". The body should include clear description for the validation of the questionnaire "reliability and validity".

It also should include description of the data driven tasks and exercises that were applied "the module or the program".

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

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is accurate and well supported by content. I would recommend making the conclusion one block without limitation paragraphing.

**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)

References are appropriate and comprehensive; they cover the different variables of the research.

***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):**