Paper: **"The Effect of Using the Flipped Learning Strategy on Developing Primary Stage Fourth Graders' English Comprehension Skills in Kuwait"**

Corresponding Author: Ahmad Alkhawaldeh

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Haggag Mohamed
South Valley University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Inayatullah Kakepoto
Quaid-E-Awam University, Pakistan

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: **Haggag Mohamed Haggag**	
University/Country: **South Valley University**	
Date Manuscript Received: **19-10-2023**	Date Review Report Submitted: **28-10-2023**
Manuscript Title: **THE EFFECT OF USING THE FLIPPED LEARNING STRATEGY ON DEVELOPING READING COMPREHENSION SKILL IN ENGLISH AMONG 4th GRADE PRIMARY STUDENTS IN KUWAIT**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0844/23**	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **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	

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**

I would recommend "adding the word " grade" and replacing "" students with pupils" so that the title would be :

The effect of using the flipped learning strategy on developing primary stage fourth graders' English comprehension skills in Kuwait.

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**

The abstract is less comprehensive but a description of the instruments and materials of the study should be included. The abstract also should include a description for the design of the study. A description of the independent variable should be included (what did you actually do, a program? a module? a teaching procedure??)

3. There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article	**3**

There are some grammatical and academic writing issues in the paper. (e.g. tenses such as" what <u>was</u> being do should be "" <u>is</u>", "as activities should be "and activities", other issues related to connectors use "" e.g. that and which"", adverbs such as "sensually", articles "without the reading" .. etc.). Grammar and spelling revision should be done. Some academic terms should be replaced (stability = reliability, previous studies = literature,...)

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**

The study followed the procedures of the quasi-experimental design with its two-group design following a pre and posting procedure. Replace the word "stability" with reliability". A description for piloting, validation comments and reliability values should be included. The study lacks an important instrument which is "reading comprehension questionnaire" to identify the important reading skills for the participants. There is less description for the independent variable; what the two groups received is not clear, especially the experimental group.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**

Results need more descriptive analysis as they lack the quantitative input. Feedback from the participants can be included. A description of the studies that are different from this study can also be included next to those who agree with the results. Following ANCOVA, this may require adding Effect Size to the results. Discussion of the different reading comprehension skills and areas developed should be included in the results.

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**

The summary is accurate and could describe the obtained results effectively. Recommendations of the study could be more prescriptive rather than descriptive. A recommendation about AI tools and their use in language learning could be included. Inclusion classes can be integrated in the recommendations as well.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
References are well written and followed correct APA7 format, although, newer and updated references could be included.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The study lacks the description of what the independent variable is and what you experimented.
- Check the statistical values, effect size, reliability value, and ANCOVA values.
- A description of the reading sub-skills should be included.
- A description of the row scores, pre and post testing procedure, and piloting should be included.
- The only dependent variable (reading comprehension) should be clearly described.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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. Dr. Inayatullah Kakepoto**	
University/Country: Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 27-09-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 3-10-2023
Manuscript Title: ***The Effect of Using the Flipped Learning Strategy on Developing Reading Comprehension Skill in English Among 4th Grade Primary Students in Kuwait***	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0844/2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: **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	

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 (Good)**
(The title of the manuscript is too long and wordy. It needs to be simplified)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(The abstract is well written but it needs to be revisited to present clear picture of the obtained results)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(There are various grammatical mistakes i.e., method)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**

(The Research Questions have not been clearly mentioned. So, it has made methodology quite confusing)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(The presentation of results is not appealing. It seems mixture of things which loses reader interest)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(The conclusion is mixture of discussion and recommendation. Hence; the conclusion does not portray a clear picture)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(References are appropriate)	

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 paper needs to be revisited since it is overburdened with extra information. The main focus of the paper should be specifically on Study Objectives, and Research Questions. So, the Research Questions, results presented, discussed and conclusion present a clear picture and generate reader interest till the end.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

After making the suggested corrections to authors the paper be accepted for publication.