

Paper: “Potent Roles of Humor in EFL Classes in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study of Lebanese Perspectives”

Submitted: 30 October 2023

Accepted: 30 January 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Nawal Nabih Ayoub

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n4p146

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vanya Katarska
Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria

Reviewer 2: Anita Mandarić Vukušić
University of Split, Croatia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Vanya Katsarska	
University/Country: Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria	
Date Manuscript Received: Nov. 15th	Date Review Report Submitted: Nov. 24th
Manuscript Title: Potent Roles of Humor in EFL Classes in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study of Lebanese Perspectives	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title clearly reveals the content of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract summarizes the main ideas of the research topic, the methodology, and the environment. It also emphasizes the contribution of the research study and the drawbacks.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some minor syntax errors could be noticed. Otherwise, the manuscript author demonstrates good grammar and vocabulary.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The structure and organization of the article follow the requirements for an academic article. The study methods are explained in a detailed manner and they can be replicated if one is provided with the surveys.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>It seems there are no factual errors. The results of the research study are supported by some answers of the questions from the questionnaires and a lot of figures.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The attitudes and opinions of EFL teachers and learners on the use of humor in higher education in Lebanon are summarized in a good way. Most of the article objectives have been met - it supports the argument that humor grabs students' attention, facilitates the learning process, reduces anxiety, etc. The conclusion that humor develops critical thinking skills and cognitive skills is not quite convincing.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>There are a lot of references which are not familiar to me as I am not a specialist in the subject. I can not say if the fundamental papers in the field are cited or not. However, the article is easy to read and one can follow the arguments.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 4.1.2024.	Date Review Report Submitted: 16.1.2024.
Manuscript Title: Potent Roles of Humor in EFL Classes in Higher Education: An Exploratory Study of Lebanese Perspectives	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1130/23	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and indicates the topic of the work our comments.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The summary is informative and in line with the research.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I have not found any difficulties with understanding of what is written.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study methods are explained but it would be much better if authors have explained the process of analyzing the qualitative part in more detail (e.g. how the authors divided the analysis, did each author analyze his part or did they take turns, how many times did they do the analysis or something similar).</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The graphs are not all clear (pictures of pie charts are not well displayed), the chart 2. and the explanation in the texts are not compatible (“they feel less anxious”, and not that “they feel anxious”. The same with chart 3., it is not clear do the participant feel distracted or more distracted. It is very important to be very specific and clear with statement. Maybe it would be easier to follow all the results if there is a tabular display for the results that can be displayed that way.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>In the conclusion, the discussion is stated, however, it is not clear on which parts the discussion is, and on which the conclusion. It would be good to insert some reference, i.e. explain the conclusions and refer to previous research.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>No comments.</i>	

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:

/