Paper: **"Enhancing the Writing Process: Integrating Applied Linguistics Learning Assessment in the Classroom"**

Corresponding Author: Hector A. Aponte-Alequin

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Anthony Rivera
Universidad Ana G. Mendez, Carolina Campus, Puerto Rico

Reviewer 2: Ángel Avilés
Universidad Ana G. Mendez, Carolina Campus, Puerto Rico

Reviewer 3: John Pahoni Stevens
ETU-Sierra Leone

Reviewer 4: Inayatullah Kakepoto
Quaid-E-Awam University, Pakistan

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*

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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Anthony Rivera	
University/Country: Universidad Ana G. Mendez, Carolina Campus, Puerto Rico	
Date Manuscript Received: January 9, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: January 10, 2025
Manuscript Title: Enhancing the Writing Process: Integrating Applied Linguistics Learning Assessment in the Classroom	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 18871	
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.	5
The title is clear and appropriately reflects the content of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is clear and concise, effectively presenting the objectives, methods, and results of the study.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
No grammatical errors or spelling mistakes were detected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

The study's methods are thoroughly and clearly explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
The body of the paper is clear, coherent, and free of identified errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusion is well-founded, effectively supported by the study's content, findings, and relevant literature.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The list of references is both comprehensive and well-suited to the study and its disciplinary focus.	

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):

The article presents an excellent case study illustrating how classroom-based learning assessment can effectively enhance teaching and learning.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article will be a valuable addition to your renowned journal.

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
yes, it is adequate
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract is okay but needs to state clearly with example the methodology used
it is highlighted in red
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
there are few syntactic errors that they need to correct by rephrasing or stating what
this mentioned model says: specifically, the curriculum revision model for language
courses proposed by Omaggio (1993)
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
the method used is okay
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
yes, the body is clear and explicit
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
the conclusion is okay but should be advised to use more of current references
ranging from 2015 to 2025
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
the list of references is comprehensive but should be encouraged to used recent
references because most of the ones used are obsolete
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The abstract is okay but needs to state clearly with example the methodology used it is highlighted in red
there are few syntactic errors that they need to correct by rephrasing or stating what this mentioned model says: specifically, the curriculum revision model for language courses proposed by Omaggio (1993)
the conclusion is okay but should be advised to use more of current references ranging from 2015 to 2025
the list of references is comprehensive but should be encouraged to used recent references because most of the ones used are obsolete

----

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The Title o the paper is appropriate and attracts the mind of readers.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Abstract follows standard research methods and presents a clear picture. However, the provided information be presented in concise form.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
I do not see any major grammatical and spelling mistakes.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The appropriate study methods have been employed in this research.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
1. The BODY of the paper is too short which needs expansion.
2. Literature Review part is completely missing.
3. Results of other recent studies from literature Review be added making this research valuable and reliable.
4. Result Section be further explained in descriptive form for easy understanding of readers.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
1. Conclusion is too short. It needs few recommendations for novice researchers in this area of study.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
References are comprehensive and in appropriate form and format.

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

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!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
1. The BODY of the paper is too short which needs to be further elaborated.
2. Literature Review part is completely missing which needs to be added to make this paper worth reading.
3. Results of other recent studies from literature Review be added supporting this research.
4. Result Section be further explained in descriptive form for easy understanding of readers.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, the TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes. the ABSTRACT clearly present objects, methods, and results.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

In this article, no grammatical or spelling errors were found.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, the study METHODS are explained clearly.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
It is correct. The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Indeed, the REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

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]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title clearly aligns with the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The title clearly presents the objectives, methodology and results in a clear and specific manner. Very well done.

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

No grammatical or syntax errors were observed in the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology used was clear, well-established and with sources properly aligned to the subject

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

No errors were observed in the body of the article.

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

The article is very well supported. The methodology used was appropriate. The assessment process used was excellent in order to meet the needs of the students in the course selected for the study. The references are aligned to the topic and the study. An accurate and very well-done article that contributes to the development of new assessment tools for writing courses.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references presented are very relevant to the subject.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

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]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

An article that will effectively contribute to the evaluation process in the field of writing in education. Well done!!!!