

Paper: “The Impact of Chatgpt on English as a Foreign Language Learners’ Writing Skills-An Experimental Study at Georgian Universities”

Submitted: 23 January 2025

Accepted: 11 April 2025

Published: 30 April 2025

Corresponding Author: Tamar Gurgenishvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n10p190

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fahmida Haque
Bangladesh University of Professionals

Reviewer 2: Saltanat Meiramova
S.Seifullin AgroTechnical University, Kazakhstan

Reviewer 3: Salvador Bautista Maldonado
University of Illinois, USA

Reviewer 4: Justine Ngang Forchap
University Institute of Science and Technology of Central Africa, Cameroon

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a valuable tool for improving English as a second language (ESL) writing skills. By offering personalized feedback and specific corrections, it helps learners enhance their grammar and composition abilities effectively. Therefore, the topic of the present research is very noteworthy, and it attempts to answer the relevant questions prevalent in the field of language in general and English Language Teaching (ELT) in Georgia specifically.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

While the results are clearly presented, the objectives and methods lack explicit clarification.

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

There are a few grammatical errors that need attention, particularly with article usage, conjunctions, and prepositions. These should be reviewed and corrected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is understood that the study has employed a quasi-experimental design to compare the efficacy of ChatGPT's application feedback against traditional teaching.

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

The main body of the paper is generally well-articulated. However, in some phrases it seems to be too wordy. Moreover, in the methodology section, it states, "This chapter describes the research methodology and the techniques used to collect both quantitative data." It would be more accurate to refer to this as a section or part instead of a chapter.

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

The conclusion is clearly expressed and accurately captures the findings of the research, backed by the relevant content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Both the in-text citations and the reference list need to be revised according to APA 7th edition guidelines. For instance, in APA style, it's important to list all authors' names in the in-text citation instead of using "et al." Additionally, in the reference section, the titles of books and journals, as well as the volume numbers, should be italicized, which is currently not the case.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please ensure that the abstract clearly states the objective and methods. Also, kindly correct any grammatical mistakes and thoroughly edit the reference section.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Sure, the title matches correctly with the body of research.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Ok. The abstract clearly projects the entire research.

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

Any grammatical or stylistic mistakes detected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

OK. It follows the traditional research pattern guideline.

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

It is very well organized.

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

The conclusion is what was expected. Due to a short number of participants the statistics were not significant as the author mentions there. As he/she mentions more research has to be done and with more participants in order to get statistical significant differences.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Sure, all the references are well formatted.

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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the tables presented must be with a smaller font, probably 9 or 10, but it must be different the font size from the general text.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is very clear and is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results

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

There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study Methods are clearly explained.

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

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

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

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

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]

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):

If only the author had explained the abbreviation-GPT in chatGPT in the introductory part of the work it would have been perfect.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, the title is clear and precisely reflect the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract contains the purpose of the article, object, short description what is done and its results.

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

n/a

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the experiment is described in details and provide the quantitative results of the experiment.

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

Yes, the body of the paper matches the requirements of the journal.

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

Yes, exactly.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, the list of references contains 36 items which is new, mostly 2023 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]

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]

4

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):
