

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_127405
Title of the Manuscript:	An Exploration of Gender Differences in the Use of English Swearwords in Vietnam
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript has the potential to contribute significantly to the field of language education by exploring the usage of English swear words among Vietnamese male and female English learners. <b>However, the authors need to establish a clearer connection between their findings and the implications for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, as the current version DOES NOT adequately articulate how these findings enhance our understanding of language learning and teaching.</b></p> <p><b>Furthermore, the paper requires serious proofreading due to numerous grammatical errors that undermine its clarity. Additionally, the research design and structure need revision for better clarification; while the authors utilized surveys and introspection for data collection, it is unclear how they validated their questionnaire or ensured the reliability of their survey study. There is also a lack of a defined scoring system or observational scale, raising questions about how observations were conducted and validated.</b></p> <p>Overall, with <b>MAJOR revisions</b> addressing these issues, the paper could make a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, it sounded ok to me based on the purpose of the study and its perspective.</b></p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Abstract needs revision. It is not clear why this study has the suggested implications of (to contribute to the improvement of English foreign language education to prepare students for cross-cultural communication among English users in Vietnam and worldwide; (iv) to contribute to research on language education that moves beyond gender-binary approach) that the authors claimed. So, imagine that we learn about the directness or indirectness of the swear words in the EFL learners, so what? How can we claim that such findings help us with being a better language teachers or how such findings contribute to the success of our language teaching programs?</b></p> <p><b>Also, the theoretical framework is NOT clear in the abstract. What is the authors' theoretical consideration in collecting their datasets and analysing the data?</b></p> <p><b>The duration of the study is also unnoticed. How long did it take?</b></p> <p><b>With regard to the research design, the abstract claims a qualitative study including a survey and observation. What was the scale of the authors' observation? On what basis the authors' scored the observed data and analyzed them?</b></p> <p><b>In the results of the abstract, there are a lot of claims that have NO support from the data analysis section of the paper.</b></p> <p><b>THERE ARE SEVERAL GRAMMATICAL MISTAKES in the abstract. For example, look at this line written by the authors: " This is also the only gender difference trait noticed is that there are a number of men, despite the fear of being judged for swearing socially, who still do it anyway."</b></p> <p><b>Or look at another line in the abstract written by the authors: " Male and female Vietnamese English learners has similar ways..."</b></p> <p><b>The text is FULL OF grammatical mistakes.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections are generally acceptable; however, each requires specific revisions:</p> <p>In the Introduction, the authors need to articulate the research gap more effectively. Currently, the gap is not clearly defined. It is essential to explain why investigating the usage of swear words by males and females is relevant to language learning contexts. Additionally, the authors should reference existing literature from other cultures that has explored similar topics to establish a broader context for their research. Clarifying why this investigation constitutes a research gap will strengthen the introduction and provide a clearer rationale for the study.</p> <p>In the literature review section, the authors fail to clearly explain the relationship between gender differences in language usage among male and female language learners and the significance of these differences in the language learning process.</p> <p>The methodology section is severely POOR; there is no discussion regarding the validity and reliability of the survey questionnaire used in the study. Furthermore, the authors do not provide any explanation of how the observation process was validated, which raises concerns about the rigor of their research methodology. Also , the procedure of the stages of data collection is <b>NOT CLEAR</b>.</p> <p>The discussion sounds ok but again, why does this study makes a contribution to the EFL classrooms? The authors stated that : " It suggests English teachers pay extra attention to the way Vietnamese students perceive the use of English swearwords" → <b>ok , so what?</b> Imagine that they paid extra attention, so what then? Why does these findings improve the second language learning procedure of the learners even with the extra attention of the teachers?</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4</b></p>	<p>The manuscript currently <b>LACKS</b> scientific rigor due to insufficient clarification of the methodological procedures. The survey questionnaire used in the study has <b>NOT been</b> validated, and there is <b>NO clear indication of its reliability</b>. Additionally, the authors <b>DO NOT</b> adequately explain the basis for validating their observations, including the validity and reliability scales employed for their datasets.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

sentences may be required for this part.	However, if the authors address these issues in their revisions, the paper has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the field. Ultimately, the quality of the manuscript depends on their ability to improve these aspects.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<b>Sounded sufficient to me.</b>	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<b>No.</b> There are many grammatical mistakes throughout the manuscript and The WHOLE PAPER needs <b>SERIOUS PROOFREADING.</b>	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has the potential to significantly contribute to language education by examining the use of English swear words among Vietnamese male and female learners. However, it requires <b>MAJOR REVISIONS</b> to clarify the connection between findings and their implications for EFL classrooms, improve language quality, and enhance the research design, particularly regarding the validation and reliability of the data collection methods. Addressing these issues could strengthen its contribution to the field.	

**PART 2:**

	<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maria Shobeiry</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Tehran, Iran</b>