



## REVIEWER REPORT

<b>Manuscript Title:</b>	Effectiveness of Language Learning Apps in Developing English Macro Skills of College Students
<b>Type of Article:</b>	Original Article

### FIRST ROUND

#### EDITOR

#### Comments and Recommendations

The study fails to account for the "gamification effect" versus "learning effect." Participants report engagement (streaks, points) as learning. The authors need to critically analyze whether the reported improvements in "sentence construction" translate to communicative competence in non-app contexts. The manuscript lacks evidence of transfer of learning.

#### REVIEWER 1

#### Specific Comments and Recommendations

Define "macro skills" (Speaking, Writing, Reading, Listening) with reference to specific competency frameworks (e.g., CEFR).

The sample selection (users who "actively used" apps) introduces severe survivorship bias. What about students who tried and quit?

Clarify the intensity of usage (minutes per day) for the participants.

The distinction between "grammar exercises" and "writing skills" needs theoretical refinement; selecting multiple-choice answers is not the same as compositional writing.

#### General Comments and Recommendations

This manuscript attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of commercial language apps via a qualitative case study. The fundamental flaw is the disconnect between the claim of "effectiveness" and the methodology (perception/self-report). Journal requires objective performance data to substantiate claims of skill development. Assessing "effectiveness" via user enjoyment or perceived gain is methodologically unsound for this journal.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

## REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>Report interview duration, modality differences (online vs face-to-face), and any observed effect on depth of responses.</p> <p>Provide the semi-structured interview guide as a supplement.</p> <p>Clarify how "macro skills" were defined for participants and whether a common definition was used across interviews.</p> <p>Distinguish app features that plausibly target each skill from features that are generic engagement tools.</p> <p>Add explicit negative cases where apps did not help or produced confusion, to avoid one-sided interpretation.</p>

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>The topic is of broad interest, but the submission is perception-based and does not provide evidence that apps improve skills beyond self-report. The qualitative design can be appropriate, yet the manuscript appears positioned too close to an effectiveness claim without objective measures or robust triangulation. Novelty is limited unless the authors specify app types and mechanisms of skill development in a way that advances theory or design guidance.</p>



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

**SECOND ROUND**

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			