

Review of: "Enhancing Academic Speaking Skills: An Immersive Virtual World Approach"

Kübra Okumus Dağdeler¹

¹ Cumhuriyet (Republik) University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is admirable as much effort is given by gathering different kinds of instruments and analysis. The article touches upon a current and important issue. On the other hand, the organization of paper causes difficulty in reading. There are various research questions, data collection tools, and analysis, which is good but requires a better organization. There should be some sub-titles in the section of Results. The Results is presented under one title, which makes the reader to ask "this analysis is response to which sub-research question and which instrument" to himself/herself. The reader has to find himself/herself or waits until the part ends(sometimes we can find the answers at the end of the parts) related to what (e.g. sub-research question and instruments) was about this analysis.

Another recommendation is related to introduction. The knowledge that is generally known such as vocabulary, grammar has been given much place. This kind of information is like "The Sun rise from the East" that everybody knows. On the other hand, everybody does not know what the previous studies are related to immersive language learning, so we need to learn more about it but this part is limited. Moreover, it is not clear what is the gap in the literature/contribution of this study/rationale for this study.

I prefer using Data Collection Tool or Instruments instead of "Materials". Materials can evoke course materials. Besides, this part should give more information about the data collection tools. For instance, one of the instrument is stated as "pre and post assesment of English". We can see what it means in another part. After the part of "Materials" the part of "Reliability" comes. Realibility of what? It can regarded as belonging to pre and post-test; we understand that it belongs to reliability of questionnaire by looking at the items in table.

Based on these reasons, I have found the paper original/effective, but it should be reviewed in terms of organization of the paper.