

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"

Jesús Toapanta¹

¹ University of Alberta

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

I was asked to comment on your article and my comments are meant to give you feedback. I hope my comments are helpful.

Jesús Toapanta, Ph.D.

University of Alberta

Commented on Dec 6, 2022.

- The last part of the title "a collaborative Approach" should be reflected in the body of the article as a section in which the "collaborative approach" is described. I would simply delete this part from the title so that the author can focus on other aspects of the paper.
- The abstract is ok, but some of its content is repeated in the introduction section. Perhaps, revising the introduction section and fleshing it out in a different way might help.
- In the intro section, "Their writings and comments were analysed holistically by the teacher researcher, who noted down all the errors she found..." It is important to consider the biases introduced by evaluating something "holistically by the teacher researcher". This needs to be discussed in detail in the paper.
- Toward the end of the introduction section, " had a positive impact on their achievement". The paper is dealing with writing, so the focus should be writing exclusively. Defining this upfront will eliminate some unnecessary information in the paper and perhaps would give a more specific outcome.
- The subheading 2 "State of the art: blogging in the language classroom", I would omit "state of the art" as this could be misleading. Also, I would be cautious of using words such as "many studies", "very beneficial", "widely studies", and I would definitely get rid of "etc." after Montaner-Villalba (2020).
- The last sentence in this section is not strong enough. Here the author wants to provide a strong justification and perhaps the gap the study intends to address. Also, at the end of this section, it might be a good idea to display the research questions, as opposed to embedding them at the beginning of the next section. However, I do not see any purpose of the research question as they are not discussed in the paper. Actually, the paper is missing the discussion section, and in the results section the results are addressed as "as for point (1), with regards to point (3), as for (4)" and

so forth.

- Section 3 “Method” needs to be organized in a better way and perhaps thought over entirely. The research methodology is taking a quantitative approach, but in the results section there is not statistical tests (a t-test, perhaps?). The study talks about independent and dependent variables, but they are not linked to the research questions. Also, there is no (detailed) description of the instrument that was used to measure the dependent variable, i.e. if thinking quantitatively, the dependent variable needs to be reliable and valid (which needs to be described in a succinct manner). There are a lot of things going on which mislead/distract the reader. In my opinion, there is no objective way of knowing what caused what in this study as there are many confounding variables. I am thinking that those that volunteered liked writing and were more motivated to engage in the blog. Anyway, I think the design needs to be thought over. I suggest addressing the paper from a qualitative perspective and bringing/write the comments from those 13 students. I do not even think it is necessary to bring in the control group.
- Avoid using terminology such as “non-probabilistic sampling” as the paper is not aiming at generalizing results. Also, in subsection 3.3, it reads “ Their writings and comments were analyzed holistically by the teacher researcher, who noted down the errors she found, and by their peers.” In a quantitative or qualitative study, the results should be analyzed systematically (the term “holistically” is not quite coherent in the context of the study as it is now); and, if errors were looked at, then was the study about grammar? And what kind of errors were looked at?
- Once the method section is clear, the path for the next sections will be clear as well. The paper does not have a discussion section, so consider including one. Also, avoid using the word “prove” as your study did not set sail to prove anything.

Best,

Jesús