



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_49224
Title of the Manuscript:	EFL INSTRUCTORS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTION AND PRACTICE TOWARDS ACTION RESEARCH: JIMMA COLLEGE OF TEACHERS EDUCATION IN FOCUS
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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><b>Your conclusions are unintelligible.</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> bullet:</b> "Most of the teachers were good perception concerning..." What does that mean?</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet:</b> "This indicates that majority of the respondents think practice of action research were unable to problem of perception, non-perceptual factors..." I am totally lost.</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet:</b> "The result of the study indicated that students were unable to satisfactory by research advisors' provision of professional assistance..." ????</p> <p><b>These conclusions read like they are written by someone who is not a native English speaker, unlike the rest of the paper. They should be reviewed and changed.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>It bothers me that the data is based on such few interviews. How can you assume conclusions? The reasonable approach would be to acknowledge the low numbers and simply state that based upon this initial study... rather than state such final conclusions.</p>	



[SDI 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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Alan Garfield
Department, University & Country	University of Dubuque, USA