



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJESBS_19741
Title of the Manuscript:	The Evaluation of Computer Engineering ESP Course from the Students Attitudes
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract 1. "As a course is being taught for several years, it should be evaluated to develop an awareness to what extent the goals behind it have been achieved." - It does not sound like a rational reason for conducting a research. - the purpose of this survey - Could this be "the purpose of this study?" - The results indicated that the ESP students' attitudes are below the expected value toward ESP course. - This is the only one result? Introduction 1. Page numbers should be included for Mackey's quote. 2. Page 2 Lines 33-39 No citation was used here. Are all these the author's ideas? 3. purpura and king (2003)?? Last name should be capitalized. Significance of the Study 1. How can this study contribute to the broader academic field or English language teaching? 2. How can this study be significant to readers around the world, rather than the Iran readers? Related Literature 1. More theoretical literature review on ESP should be conducted. 2. Theoretical framework could be provided and discussed. 3. The writing does not follow the APA format in related literature. Discussion 1. The discussion is too weak without the theoretical framework. 2. What are the implications? Conclusion 1. What are the limitations of this study? 2. What are the issues for further study?	Dear Editor, Thanks for your meticulous reading of my paper. In response to your paper: Abstract: 1-When teaching-learning of a course is wrong in an academic system of a country, a research needs to be conducted in order to aware authorities the ineffectiveness of current program. 2- you are right. 3- This study was to examine the students attitude accompanied the difference with Male and Female students attitudes. Furthermore, the result has provided the participants analysis. Furthermore, To give solution and suggestions for improvement of this program. 1- You are right. 2- This is the paraphrase that I have done. 3- you are quite right. 1- We have offered practical suggestions with regard to students' responses. If academic institutions take it into consideration , It can facilitate the learning. 2- As far as we know, they are a lot of ESP authors in the world. This paper can make them aware of the current situations in all regions of the world. As a result, They can publish practical ESP sources and effective texts books. Related literature 1. You are right. We added it. 2. You are right Dear. 3. Thanks a lot. We revised it. Discussion. 1. You are right. 2. We added it. Conclusion. 1. We added it. 2. We added it. Thank you very much.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		