

# Review of: "On the use of blogging in the classroom of English for Specific Purposes in times of COVID-19 to promote written skills: a collaborative approach"

Laia Canals

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript presents an interesting study of a topic that should be appealing to many readers. It examines the use of blogging as an extra activity to practice written skills during the lockdown of the covid-19 pandemic. Given the increase of online pedagogical practices in during and in the aftermath of the pandemic, the study is timely as well. However, I have a few issues that I'd like the author to consider.

The author indicates that "This informal aspect of blogs is indeed an efficient resource to let students express themselves more naturally." What does the author mean by more naturally?

The author indicates that "Murray and Hourigan (2008) and Martín Monje (2011) focus on blogs for specific purposes". Can you specify which specific purposes?

## Method

The exam was targeting mostly writing and vocabulary. How can the author measure whether blogging promotes writing skills (research question 1) based on this exam?

Can the author clarify whether it's the median or the mean that they show in table 2. If it's the mean, then they should report the standard deviation as well.

In the end of the results, the author indicates that "In light of these data, we can say that a connection may exist between the students' participation in the blogging activity and their final results in the exams." The issues with is that this was not indicated in the research question, which was concerned with promoting writing skills.

Can the author explain why table 2 shows marks in June and in September? Was this a longitudinal study? Were the September marks some sort of post-test? Did students take classes all summer? Can she address in the paper why the marks in the EG are much lower than the control in September? Does the statement in the previous paragraph still hold in this case?

I am not convinced that the data presented in the paper can sustain the claim made in the conclusions "blogging is a motivating activity that contributes to promoting written skills (especially production skills) in the learning of ESP in an

online environment.”

And finally, as a general comment, the paper would benefit from a thorough proofreading. I'm detailing below a few examples of sentences which contain one or more mistakes:

- as for of the Degree in Tourism

- This course, aimed at students who already possess a B1 level

- a blending learning university.

- which made practically the whole world lock at home

- I outline the methodological aspects of this work.

- In this way,

- composed of 35 students

- Sentence repeated twice: This course, aimed at students who already possess a B1 level (according to the CEFRL, 2001, 2018), intends to help them reach a B2 level.