Paper: **"Using Efficient Planning for Achieving Course Learning Outcomes in EFL Classes at Taif University"**

Corresponding Author: Awwad Othman Abdelaziz Ahmed

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Haggag Mohamed
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Muhammad Imran Shah
Government College University Faisalabad Pakistan

Reviewer 4: Adil Jamil
Amman University, Jordan

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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: Prof Adil M. Jamil	
University/Country: Amman Univ. Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: Sept 23, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct 3, 2023
Manuscript Title: Achieving Course Learning Outcomes through Efficient Planning of Teaching: A Case Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0763/23	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**

Yes, the title is clear and to the point.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
Yes, it does to a great extent	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
The paper is free of any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
It does to a great extent	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
No serious errors detected	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
I can say, the author's conclusions go in line with the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
Though Applied Linguistics and Teaching Methods are very active fields, most of the references used are 25 years old and more, except 4 of them.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Though I am not very much interested in using statistics in Humanities, I enjoyed reading this article. The findings, I should say, can be more reliable if the population of the study would comprise more faculty members from other comparable departments or language centers, not limited to one language center, and only 26 participants in the questionnaire. By large, the article is publishable.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
No comment. Best of luck

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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: Dr Muhammad Imran Shah	
University/Country: Government College University Faisalabad Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 25-09-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29-09-2023
Manuscript Title: **Achieving Course Learning Outcomes through Efficient Planning of Teaching: A Case Study**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.07.2023	
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.	**good**
The sample of population is not mentioned whom the learning outcome is achieved?	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**good**
The type of content is not in the same proportion i-e 1/3 each for background, methodology and findings	
3. There are few punctuations error	**better**
Needs to remove commas in a sentence	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**excellent**
(appropriate)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**excellent**
(appropriate)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**good**
More focus on practical implication and less theoretical	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**good**
Most of the references are not according to APA manual	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A very positive endeavor to move knowledge ahead in lecture planning

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
The research study is worth reading for the future perspectives among academia