

Review of: "Enhancing Academic Spoken English Skills Through an Immersive Virtual World: A Pilot Study Focusing on Motivation, Confidence, and Teacher Presence"

Son Nguyen Van ¹

¹ Thuyloi University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you the open journal so much for inviting me to review the paper. Warmly thank you the authors for making efforts in writing a manuscript which reports the experimental research you have conducted.

Regarding the strengths, the topic is timely and important, which has potential to contribute significantly to the literature and improving the quality of teaching. The authors were providing sound understanding of the literature and making great efforts to describe their experiment. The description was very detailed and helped me to understand more about the research. The authors were aware of limitations and provided detailed recommendation for future research. The manuscript itself was well-structured and improved a lot more compared to the first version.

However, there are areas for improvements (to consider) as follow:

- The study is quite lengthy and complicated in the way that it included too many variables to test, thereby lacking the focus
- There are quite too many research questions and hypotheses to deal with in a single study, which may lead to frustration when reading
- The number of participants was quite small to conduct inferential statistics and I did not see the statistics to show whether the tests are feasible or not. Also the description of participants was not comprehensive enough. I think more details such as language proficiency, years of studying English....
- There should be separate parts for instruments (what are they? how do they look like? Do you adapt them from available sources or do you self-develop them? what language do you use in the instruments?...), data collection (how did you deliver the survey? how did you interviews? how long? how did you conduct tests?), and data analysis (how did you analyze different types of data? how did you "mix" them to answer research questions?)
- In the findings, the tests were not presented in an expected manner, for example, why did you use Spearman correlation, not others? why t-test, not others? normal distribution? what were the important themes in the interviews? how did they support or were supported by the quantitative data and other types of data? As a result of unclear presentation of methodology, the presentation of findings was quite hard to follow, unfortunately
- The explanation of the findings in the discussion needs to be more thorough. For example, what can be the reasons for "as established by both the qualitative and the quantitative data, participants were satisfied with the style of learning

(course evaluation) and connected with the VW technology”

- The implications, offered in the conclusion, should have been more detailed and relevant to the research findings. For example, what different stakeholders should do towards such findings. You said “policy makers should explore ways to harness VW technology to improve quality & effectiveness of online language education programs”, so what can those ways?

I look forward to the revision of the paper. I wish the authors best luck in their research.

Best regards,