

**Paper: “Evaluation of an ESP Textbook Used at the College of Business Studies in Kuwait from the Learners' Perspective Regarding Their Future Career Needs”**

**Submitted: 21 November 2024**

**Accepted: 22 December 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Nour Haidar Haidar

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n35p44

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dorjana Klosi Flett  
University of Vlore “Ismail Qemali, Albania

Reviewer 2: Morel Marly Ohiny Mensah  
UAC/FLASH – Adjarra, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is descriptive, but too long. maybe the author should reconsider the reformulation of the title and make it shorter.

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

The first part of the abstract is general and maybe should be placed in the introduction section, but it is irrelevant in the abstract section.

.....This research aims to evaluate the Business Results textbook used in ESP classrooms at the College of Business Studies in Kuwait. This study focuses on the perspectives of English language learners on the textbook used and its effectiveness in preparing them for their future business careers.....the author should consider paraphrasing and put the information of both sentences in one.

.....For this purpose, a checklist is prepared for learners to analyze their perspectives on a textbook. This checklist is used in interviews and questionnaires to determine their views on the textbook. ....The same remark is used for these two sentences.

more information on methodology of the study, the participants, etc, and findings must be mentioned in the abstract section so that the reader can have a clear, better idea of what the paper is about and how the study was conducted and about its results.

In overall, the abstract section must be reformulated.

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

Yes, there are some grammatical mistakes. The manuscript needs proofreading and many sentences need paraphrasing.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Explain the role of the English instructors in the study.

Provide more information on the previous checklist used to develop the checklist for this study.

Give the correct number of the questions and explain how the questions were analysed.

Give details about the interviews with the instructors and learners, how they were conducted, what questions were asked, etc.....

Since the study involves humans, please provide the code of ethics and privacy to protect the data and sensitive information of the participants.

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

results section is ok, in general. More information should be provided for research question no.2.

The discussion section is very short, more explanation is needed because this is the

part where the results of the study are interpreted and analyzed. The literature review section is very long, it be shorter, but the discussion of the study must be more analytical and explanatory.

No challenges during the study are mentioned .

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

In general, the conclusion section is okay.

A few suggestions:

Textbook evaluation is seen as critical since the results may be used to make decisions on the future of textbooks (Siegel, 2021). In order to develop and improve a curriculum, textbooks for ESP programs and ELT in general must be evaluated. This work has contributed to the area of ESP, particularly by underlining the importance of textbooks in ESP programs. It also relies on previous research showing the importance of evaluating ESP textbooks to confirm whether they are suitable for students' needs, thereby achieving program objectives..... put it few paragraphs below. ....

This, however, might serve as a starting point for future study.

In the future, studies could pursue this matter. There is also a need for more research to be conducted in order to investigate the students' pe.....repetition of the same idea.

This section should be paraphrased and reorganized.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

it is okay.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

the author should consider the above suggestions.

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title of this article is in line with its content. But the part "Case study" should be removed for accuracy.

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

The abstract clearly presents objectives and instruments. But it fails in stating the research methodology and presenting the results.

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

This article is almost free from grammatical errors and spelling mistakes

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are explained clearly. But for better understanding, the writer should provide the check list, the questionnaire and the interviews grid.

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

The body is clear and does not contain errors. Nevertheless, the absence of numbering the sections and subsections makes the reading difficult

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

The conclusion is accurate but it needs to be reorganized. The 4th paragraph (talking about methodologies) should come before the 3rd one (talking about the findings).

Moreover, the key findings should be mentioned in that part.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear author, congratulations on the quality of your research. Thank for considering those minor revisions mentioned above to improve the final version of this study. Some in-text quotations are not paraphrases, so they should be italicized.

-----