

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: Aspects in the Development of Critical Thinking in Asian EFL Higher Education: A Critical Review

Submitted: 10.11.2022 Accepted: 19.01.2023 Published: 31.12.2022

Corresponding Author: Thiri Soe Email: thiri.soe.t3@dc.tohoku.ac.jp

Doi: 10.19044/llc.v9no4a1

Peer review: Reviewer 1: Wafaa A. Mostafa Hussein

Reviewer 2: Andrew Junghan Ahn

Published: 31.12.2022





Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: LLC promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:	
University/Country:		
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:	
Manuscript Title:		
"Aspects in the Development of Critical Thinking in Asian EFL Higher Education: A Critical Review"		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No		
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No		

Evaluation Criteria:





Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(<i>Please insert your comments</i>) The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article.	

<i>Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract presents the research hypothesis, aims, objectives and resu	
The abstract presents the research hypothesis, aims, objectives and resu	
author has not clarified his approach (qualitative/ quantitative, descript research methods in the abstract.	
3. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
The reader can <i>infer</i> that the study methods are relevant to the topic as hroughout the research. However, these methods must have been state beginning.	
4. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Please insert your comments)	
The research is supported to prove its credibility and reliability.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
The conclusion supports the grounds of the study. There is a viable co- conclusion and the premises of the study.	nnection between the
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Please insert your comments)	
The references are comprehensive, appropriate, and up- to- date.	





7. There are grammar and spelling errors.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
The body of the paper is coherent, logical, well organized. Nevertheless, errors:	it contains minor
Many sentences are run-on, unclear and hard to follow.	
Minor structural and stylistic errors	
Essay formatting	
Conciseness (For example, instead of writing "His assumption is that skills that prevent students from producing well-crafted arguments and author could have written: "He assumes that weak language skills preproducing well-crafted arguments and compositions.)	d compositions.", the
Mechanics of writing: Punctuations/ Missing hyphens	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The research is fundamentally relevant to the field of foreign language acquisition since it depicts the crucial role of critical thinking in the educational process. The paper is viable and can pave the way for further research. However, it needs minor revisions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:





Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: LLC promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:	
University/Country:		
Date Manuscript Received: 17/12/2022Date Review Report Submitted:		
Manuscript Title: Aspects in the Development of Critical Thinking in Asian EFL Higher Education: A Critical Review		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes		

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]





1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The whole body is described as intended by the author to support the title of paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is well presenting object, method, and result necessary to understand the whole paper.	
3. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The author is using a method relatively suited for this kind of critical review paper.	

4. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The result contains well summarized description. No errors.	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The summary of the paper is properly given, suggesting implications.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
All references the author quotes in the paper are provided.	
7. There are grammar and spelling errors.	5
It seems like there are no errors in grammar and spelling.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The notion of 'critical thinking' is not new but application of this to English education, particularly in the area of EFL is not so easy as theoretically described. First of all, the





development of critical thinking skills in language teaching instructional strategies would be a good start and basis for the other areas like teaching materials and pedagogical knowledge.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

