

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_130678 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Research on the Reform of College English Teaching Model: Embracing Mobile Assisted Collaborative Language Learning |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The research presented on the reform of the college English teaching model, with its focus on embracing mobile-assisted collaborative language learning (MACLL), tackles a topic of undeniable importance. The integration of technology and collaborative learning undeniably holds significant potential to enhance language acquisition. However, the current presentation leans heavily towards a showcase of arguments and narratives, lacking a robust foundation in established theories and supported by empirical data. To strengthen the analysis and convince readers of the proposed model's effectiveness, the research must be more firmly grounded in relevant theoretical frameworks and rigorously supported by empirical evidence. | Thank you very much for your instructive suggestions. I have corrected the manuscript on you suggestions. |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Please delete “research” Reformation of College English Teaching Model: Embracing Mobile Assisted Collaborative Language Learning | I have delete “research” |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | For better clarity and understanding, the abstract should ensure a strong connection between the stated research aim (enhancing teaching quality and students' comprehensive English abilities) and the conclusions drawn. The conclusion section should explicitly summarize the research findings and highlight how they contribute to achieving the stated aim. This will help readers understand the significance and impact of the research and its potential for improving language education | I have rewritten the abstract on your suggestions. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | A significant shortcoming of this manuscript is the lack of clarity and detail in the description of the research methodology. Essential information such as the data collection methods employed, the specific research setting, and the procedures used for data analysis is either missing or inadequately explained. Furthermore, the abstract mentions a combination of theoretical analysis and practical case studies, but the manuscript fails to provide a clear explanation of the underlying theories and how they were integrated into the research design. This lack of methodological detail undermines the scientific validity and trustworthiness of the research findings. | I have added the research methodology section. I have explained the findings in detail. |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The current manuscript only includes references in the introduction section. To enhance the validity and credibility of the research results, it is essential to incorporate relevant citations throughout the text, particularly in the results and discussion sections. This will allow readers to trace the evidence and arguments back to their original sources | I have added some reference in the discussion section |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The use of overly complicated diction can hinder clarity and accessibility for a wider audience. Simpler vocabulary choices would likely improve the readability and overall impact of the text. | I have polished the language. Thank you for your comments. |
| Optional/General comments | The research appears to lack a strong scientific and theoretical foundation. While the elaboration may be present, without a clear grounding in established theories and research, the validity of the research results is difficult to assess and may not be convincing to the reader. | Thank you very much. I have improved the manuscript on your instructive comments. |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <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> |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |