Paper: **"Feedback as Scaffolded Instruction in the Assessment of L2 Writing Tasks"**

Corresponding Author: Zena Abu Shakra

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Haggag Mohamed Haggag
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Okechukwu Chukwuma
St. Augustine University of Tanzania

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title, though descriptive, but lacks key scientific elements such as clear variables, sample, or type of design. The title is rather an essay-type title rather than scientific research title. I would recommend changing the tool within the following purpose: Using Assessment as a Scaffolding Instrument for Foreign Language Writing Feedback

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is not clear and incomplete as it does not include key data such as sample, design, instruments and recommendations. The abstract is less consistent and lacks the academic description of the study. It mixes between terms such as paper, study, etc.). The abstract should describe the design of the study within the frame of the previous study over which it was built.

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

There are different grammar and spelling errors in the paper. Grammatical and spelling checking is recommended. For instance:
- holisitic (holistic)
-fostering learner autonomy where somewhat (were)
-study "makes" 2 assumptions
- Second Language (a)cquisition
- amendments on (to)
- first year (-)
-The quality of learner? (the learner).
-principles in fact
- a 2 week period
-out on (at)
- The was followed by relation (this was ...)
-Revison (revision)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Although the paper builds on another original research (Abu Shakra 2013) which explored the effect of enacting learner autonomy, one aspect of scaffolding, through feedback on writing tasks, but it did not explain the type of research design followed nor the exact methodology adopted. There is no description of sampling, adjustment, instruments or method. It did not describe the type of academic design followed for the "transcription analysis" followed in the study. There should be a rubric for academic analysis of participants' responses. The paper did not describe the

methodology followed in "The linguistic analysis of spoken discourse". In the discussion part, there is no introductory paragraph that sums the methodology followed in the discussion. The discussion could not relate the results within the theoretical literature related to its variables. Most of literature cited dates back to 1987, 1981, 2000, 2012, which lacks new trends in the field related to the variables of the paper. The paper did not describe any tools, materials or instruments adopted for the purpose of the academic design.

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

There are different academic errors such as hierarchy of research design procedures, description of variables, definitions of terms, instrumentation and valid assessment procedures. The body adopts SLA rather than FLL approach although the study was run in an Arabic country that adopts English as Foreign rather than second language.

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

The conclusion, though comprehensive, but lacks significant academic elements such as avoiding reference in the beginning to other research. Description of research design followed and further recommendations and suggestions for further research. Avoided citation in the summary (e.g. Andrade ,2005) . Relating the value of feedback in assessment within the results of the study not within research perspectives.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Most of the references are out-dated. References did not follow sound APA writing style and has various errors in citation.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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. Okechukwu Chukwuma	
University/Country:St. Augustine University of Tanzania	
Date Manuscript Received: June 23, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: July 10, 2023
Manuscript Title: Assessment as Instruction in Feedback on L2 Writing Tasks	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.	4
(Please insert your comments) The title is in sync with the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	0
(Please insert your comments)	

The article has no abstract. Abstract is missing. I have indicated in the article that abstract must be provided.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
(Please insert your comments) Just a few errors which I already indicated in the article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
(Please insert your comments) Method is well explained	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments) There is the need to present the results in the form of outlining them for clarity.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments) The conclusion is good but there is need to put forward some recommendations in line with the findings and conclusions of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
(Please insert your comments) The references lack some vital information which should be provided. I have identified them in the article.	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: