Paper: **"The Effectiveness of Wordwall in Improving Pronunciation, Stress Placement, and Intonation for B2-Level English Psychology Students: An Experimental Case Study at a Georgian University"**

Corresponding Author: Mari Makharashvili

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tarik Saadi
Groupe ISCAE, Casablanca, Morocco

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

Reviewer 3: Raúl Rocha
Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is very good, it is clear and specific.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The summary is well structured
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The writing is very good
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, and the statistical treatment is good.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The article is very clear and concise. It's very well structured and follows a logical sequence.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is brief but logical
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The list of references is exhaustive
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):
It is suggested not to rely on too many indirect quotes. The article seems simple, but it is very good. It addresses a relevant and urgent issue.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes, the title is clear and adequate to the content . All the development is about the impact of Wordwall on students' pronunciation
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes, all the different parts are included. But this abstract can be improved by adding the methodology approach
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Yes, there are some. grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The lack of pages numbering prevented the reviewer to mention some pages with mistakes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
yes, the methods are clearly explained
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Yes, the body is clear.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Yes, the conclusion is accurate. It clearly sums up the whole paper.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
This list of references is comprehensive and appropriate. But it lacks consistency in words processing, using different Theme Fonts.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

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]
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]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Congratulations on this paper contributing to teaching and learning field.
Nevertheless, this paper needs to be improved.
Strengths:
- the paper respects the different parts of a research work
- the experimentation is well conducted
Weaknesses:
- poor word processing (mind the spacing and the fonts)
- lack of clear general objective
- the three specific objectives are not different
- the three research questions look the same (they should have explored challenges, impact, and implementations)
- the organization lacks numbering leading to confusion (sections and titles are not numbered)
- absence of page numbers
- poor discussion (the discussion should hinge around the three research questions, based on the findings and the collected data)

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title of the paper presents a case study that explores an intriguing intersection between educational technology and psychology within the context of a Georgian university. However, the use of the word "impact" is somewhat broad and could be misleading, as it does not specify the type of impact being studied or the method by which it will be measured. Additionally, the title does not clarify the methodological approach employed in the study, which leaves the reader uncertain about how the research was conducted. Furthermore, the phrase "A case of Georgian university"

suggests a geographically narrow focus, which may limit the broader applicability of the findings.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The purpose of the study is clearly identified, providing a strong foundation for the research. Additionally, the sampling technique is well presented, giving the reader insight into how participants were selected. The data collection tools and techniques are also mentioned, outlining the methods used to gather information. However, while the results are clearly identified, the implications of these findings are not discussed. Furthermore, the paper does not include any suggestions for future research, which would help guide further exploration in this area.

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

The writing is academically sound, with correct spelling and grammar. However, the flow between sentences could be smoother, as the structure of paragraphs throughout the text could be refined. The writing style feels somewhat disjointed and the citations need to be more consistent to improve clarity and polish.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The sampling technique is not identified in the methodology section.

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

Tables, charts and graphs are neither correctly titled nor cited in the text.

Major formatting issues are recurring throughout the paper.

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

The conclusion reads more like an abstract and doesn't quite capture the essence of a conclusion. It needs to be rewritten to provide a clearer summary and a stronger closing to the discussion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references and bibliography section is inconsistent and poorly formatted, requiring revision. Additionally, some references listed in the bibliography are not cited in the text, which needs to be addressed for accuracy and coherence.

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]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The topic being investigated is highly significant and offers a substantial contribution to the existing literature. However, the author should strengthen the presentation by employing a more rigorous research methodology and clearly articulating the scientific implications, all while maintaining a well-written and academic style.