International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
*Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines*

**Peer-Review Report Form**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Manuscript Title:** | Grammar Learning among BSEd English Major Students: An Assessment of Grammatical Features |
| **Type of Article:** | Original Article |

## FIRST ROUND

### Editor

| **General Comments and Recommendations** |
|---|
| The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations. |

### Reviewer 1

| **General Comments and Recommendations** |
|---|
| The topic of grammar learning among English majors is very practical and always needed, because we expect future language teachers to be experts in English. Your paper is generally easy to read, and your flow of ideas from the introduction to the conclusion makes sense. |

| **Specific Comments and Recommendations** |
|---|
| Introduction and Theoretical Framework<br>Your background is nice because you connect the global problems with local Philippine contexts. That gives a good picture. But, I noticed you anchored the whole study on the Structuralist Grammar Theory by Ferdinand de Saussure from 1916. This theory is quite old. While it is foundational, modern language education usually uses communicative or cognitive theories. Since you also talk a lot about communicative proficiency, maybe you can try to add a modern theory alongside Saussure to make your framework fit better with today's teaching styles. |
| Methodology |

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
*Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines*

| |
|---|
| This is my biggest concern in your whole paper. You wrote that the grammar test was given online using the Kahoot! platform, and also face-to-face in the classroom. These are two completely different worlds. Kahoot is usually fast, has colorful screens, uses countdown timers, and creates a lot of pressure. A face-to-face paper test is quiet and lets the student think slowly. This difference makes a huge bias in your data. Students taking the Kahoot test might get lower scores just because they panicked about the time. You must explain how you controlled this difference. If you cannot, you need to declare it very clearly as a major limitation of your study. |
| Methodology - Instrument Reliability<br>Please double-check your data analysis here. You reported that the survey questionnaire got a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.990. In statistics, getting a 0.990 is suspiciously high. When alpha is above 0.95, it usually means your questions are just repeating the exact same thing over and over, so they are redundant. Please review your items or re-calculate this to be sure it is correct. |
| Results<br>In Table 1, you show that the mean score for Subject-Verb Agreement is 1.15. Based on your grading rubric, a score of 1.00 to 1.50 means they only got 0 to 2 items correct out of 10. Remember, your participants are second to fourth-year English majors. Getting only 1 correct answer out of 10 in basic subject-verb agreement is very alarming for future English teachers. You reported it honestly, which is good, but you need to emphasize how serious this is. |
| Discussion<br>Your discussion is okay, but it feels a bit too short. You made a good point that students learn better when they frequently use the grammar feature. But you have so much good literature in your introduction that you forgot to use here. For example, you mentioned studies from Iraq and Nigeria in the introduction. Bring them back in the discussion. Tell the reader, Our finding that subject-verb agreement is very low matches the findings of Salman et al. in Iraq... Doing this will make your arguments much richer and show you know the global literature well. |

**Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.**

| **Decision** | |
|---|---|
| | Accept the manuscript for publication. |
| / | Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. |
| | Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication. |

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
*Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines*

**Reviewer 2**

| **General Comments and Recommendations** |
|---|
| The manuscript discusses a relevant issue because English major students are expected to have strong grammar competence as future teachers. |
| **Specific Comments and Recommendations** |
| The research gap needs to be sharpened. The introduction presents many studies on grammar difficulties, but it does not clearly show what is new in this study aside from using another group of students. The authors should explain more clearly why this assessment is needed and how it adds to previous findings. |
| The instruments need more detailed explanation. Since the survey questionnaire and grammar test were researcher-made, the authors should provide sample items, number of items per grammar feature, scoring procedure, and basis for interpretation. Without this, it is difficult to judge if the test really measured grammar learning properly. |
| The validity and reliability discussion is incomplete. The survey has a very high Cronbach's alpha, but the grammar knowledge test, which is the main tool, has no clear reliability result. The item difficulty analysis is mentioned, but the actual results are not reported. This weakens confidence in the findings. |
| The data analysis is too limited. The study used only mean scores and frequency counts, but it does not report standard deviation, distribution of scores, or comparison across year levels. These additional analyses could give a better picture of students' grammar learning and the pattern of their weaknesses. |
| The use of both online and face-to-face test administration may affect the consistency of the results. The authors should explain how they controlled differences between Kahoot-based testing and classroom testing, especially in terms of time limit, supervision, internet access, and possible test-taking behavior. |
| The discussion needs to go beyond repeating the results. The paper should explain why students performed very low in subject-verb agreement and verbals but very high in pronouns. The authors should connect these findings more strongly with prior studies, classroom practices, and possible gaps in grammar instruction. |
| The conclusion is useful but still general. The authors recommend focused and responsive grammar instruction, but they should specify what kind of intervention or instructional support may address the weakest grammar areas. This will make the study more useful for teachers and curriculum planners. |

**Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.**

| **Decision** | |
|---|---|
| | Accept the manuscript for publication. |
| / | Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. |
| | Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication. |

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
*Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines*

**SECOND ROUND**

| **Decision** | **Editor** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Accept the manuscript for publication. | / | / | / |
| Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. | | | |
| Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication. | | | |