

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_75920
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATING FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENTS' INTERACTIONS IN GRADE 11 ENGLISH CLASSROOM: THE CASE OF THREE SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN TEMBARO WOREDA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Researcher should enrich background with <b>theories</b> in the field. He should not also neglect <b>current studies</b> to up-date readers with what previous researchers have come up with and how his study connects former work conclusions to his current findings.</p> <p><b>Possessiveness</b> should be reviewed. For example, in the specific objective, namely aim no.4, the expression “teachers’ do” is incorrect because no need for using possessive case here.</p> <p><b>Relative</b> cases be it for phrases or clauses should be re-considered. For example, in the basic research question, notably no. 3, an expression like “What factors that” is mal form and the well-form here is to use the question without “that”.</p> <p>Section 1.5 should be deleted because it is repetitive and section 1.6 should be shifted to be right after section 1.2.</p> <p>Abbreviations and acronyms along with section 1.8 should be put under the abstract.</p> <p>The title “review of related literature” should be deleted. The content of this section should be “mated” with introduction because such information background should be at the beginning. Also, definitions included in this section (a) should be sub-sectioned in the new introduction under a title “Concepts” (b) should not be highlighted in bold. Some sections’ titles in this section (review of related literature) should be deleted in the new introduction and their content should be included within other sections (The less the number of the sections are, the better the introduction becomes). New introduction should not exceed 9 pages, not 19! This is not an MA thesis or PhD dissertation. No need to repeat any information and/ or idea twice.</p> <p>Methodology is how the research will be done, part of analysis is the answer and conclusive part should report previous part’s findings. They should all be homogeneous. No need for the section entitled “summary” in the last part.</p>	<b>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Background should not exceed 9 sections and subsections. Organizing introductory information make them readable.	Okay
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Introduction needs to be changed to be rich and more informative.</p> <p>Grammar should be double checked.</p> <p>Content format should be synthesized.</p> <p>The study needs to be more professional content-wise, format-wise and other-wise.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	