

Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: An Error Analysis of ESL College Students' Research Abstracts in Academic Writing

Version: 1

Comments:

The paper investigates a relevant linguistic issue; however, several methodological and reporting areas need reinforcement to meet international academic standards.

Major

1. The manuscript states that 100 abstracts were analyzed, but does not describe how these abstracts were selected from different disciplines (random sampling? convenience? stratified?). This should be made explicit to establish representativeness and avoid sampling bias.
2. Since error analysis can be subjective, it is expected that more than one evaluator verified the coded errors. Please clarify whether another rater participated, and if so, include inter-rater reliability (e.g., Cohen's Kappa). If analysis was done solely by the researcher, this is a limitation that must be declared.
3. The study uses Corder (1967), but clearer operational examples would strengthen the methodology. For instance, what counted as a "mechanical error" vs "lexical substitution"? This section feels descriptive only and should show at least one coded example per category.
4. The discussion re-describes findings rather than interpreting them critically. Consider deepening the analysis:
 - Why are punctuation errors highest? Influence of L1? Lack of formal instruction?
 - Are these results consistent with Wang et al. (2020)? Or contradictory?
 - What new contribution does this study add beyond confirming previous literature?
5. "Task-based writing activities" and "guided practice" are mentioned but not operationalized. Provide specific interventions (e.g., weekly abstract-writing clinics, peer-editing rubrics, Grammarly integration, etc.)

Minor

1. Abstract should clearly state "n = 100" early.
2. Ethical section is strong but duplicated sentences appear at the end — please delete redundancy.
3. Tables are clear but percentage formatting should be uniform.
4. Check inconsistent capitalization (e.g., "Research Abstract Error Analysis Checklist" vs "error analysis checklist").

Overall recommendation: Accept after minor to moderate revision.

Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: An Error Analysis of ESL College Students' Research Abstracts in Academic Writing

Version: 1

Comments:

This is a well-written and highly relevant study addressing a real gap in ESL academic writing. The structure is logical, the data are clearly presented, and the educational implications are meaningful. I commend the author for analyzing 100 real abstracts, which gives the paper strong credibility and practical value.

Major

1. Add one sample of coded analysis (raw text → error label → category). Even a short table showing how a sentence was analyzed would help readers replicate the methodology.
2. Include 1–2 sentences acknowledging limitations. For example:
 - Only abstracts from one city (Iligan)
 - Single-rater coding (if applicable). This does not weaken the study, it improves scholarly honesty.
3. Strengthen implications with realistic classroom ideas
 - Short abstract-writing workshops
 - Sentence-combining exercises for punctuation errors
 - Article/preposition drills for omission errors

Minor

1. Add transition sentence at the start of Conclusion

Example: “Drawing from the quantified errors across five linguistic categories, this study concludes that...”

Overall recommendation: Accept with very minor revisions. Strong paper.

Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: An Error Analysis of ESL College Students' Research Abstracts in Academic Writing

Version: 2

Comments:

Revisions are substantially complied. The paper is now recommended for publication.

Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: An Error Analysis of ESL College Students' Research Abstracts in Academic Writing

Version: 2

Comments:

Revisions are substantially complied. The paper is now recommended for publication.