



Paper: “University Students’ Perceptions of a CLIL-Based Model in Teaching Aviation English Listening Skills”

Submitted: 31 July 2025

Accepted: 31 August 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Elizaveta Dalakishvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n23p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Claudia Pisoschi
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Vanya Katsarska
Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria

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: Vanya Katsarska	
University/Country: Bulgarian Air Force Academy, Bulgaria	
Date Manuscript Received: 08 Aug. 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 Aug. 2025
Manuscript Title: University Students' Perceptions of a CLIL-Based Model in Teaching Aviation English Listening Skills	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---09.---34.08.2025---	
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:	

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.	4
Although the title of the manuscript is not concise, it properly reflects its content.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is concise and clear. It's easy to read and accurately summarizes the goal, objectives and content of the research.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Correct and appropriate language/spelling.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The method is clearly explained, reasonable, and leads to solid conclusions. It appears replicable, allowing other researchers to repeat the study.	

Regarding the structure and organization of the article: while the introduction is informative, its strong emphasis on assessment seems somewhat misaligned with the article's stated focus on the CLIL approach outlined in the title, abstract, and main content.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Results are logical and well-founded.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The topic is timely, and the content is engaging, making it potentially interesting to the Journal's readership. However, the article does not appear to offer novel contributions to the field, as it primarily reiterates findings and perspectives already well established in the existing research literature on CLIL in Aviation English.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are good.	

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):

Dear authors, the topic of the article is timely, and the content is engaging.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Claudia-Gabriela Pisoschi	
University/Country: University of Craiova, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: August 11, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: August 20, 2025
Manuscript Title: University Students' Perceptions of a CLIL-Based Model in Teaching Aviation English Listening Skills	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.08.2025	
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. (Please insert your comments) Yes, the title fully corresponds to the content of the article and it is quite clear.	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Yes, the abstract presents the objectives of the study, the method and the results.	5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	4

I suggest checking the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The article title – check the punctuation; • Page 5, the last paragraph which explains Table 2, check the punctuation, the sentence formation (there is a full stop after the time clause); • Page 14, figure 2, check the spelling; • Page 17, the last paragraph, you might consider inserting a preposition; • References – check the missing full stops after each reference; reference no.8 – the name of the author is repeated. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are explained clearly: they are both quantitative (allowing for statistical generalization) and qualitative allowing for a contextual interpretation of the students' attitudes, motivation and reaction to CLIC in relation to Aviation English.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are accurate and fully support the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data, considering the objectives of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are comprehensive, appropriate and correctly cited. But, please, check Mohan (1986) and Basturkmen (2010), they are cited in the text but do not appear under References.	

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):

A very interesting, thorough, comprehensive and well-structured study. Many pertinent observations which might prove quite useful for similar studies.

Please, see the suggestions below.

I suggest checking the following:

- The article title – check the punctuation;
- Page 5, the last paragraph which explains Table 2, check the punctuation, the sentence formation (there is a full stop after the time clause);
- Page 14, figure 2, check the spelling;
- Page 17, the last paragraph, you might consider inserting a preposition;

References – check the missing full stops after each reference; reference no.8 – the name of the author is repeated.

The references are comprehensive, appropriate and correctly cited. But, please, check Mohan (1986) and Basturkmen (2010), they are cited in the text but do not appear under References.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: