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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
• An aim for the paper is provided but could be reworked as a research question or hypothesis.
• The paper needs to be proof read and edited more closely.

Method section:
• Use of verb tense in the text needs to be checked.
• The design and participants section could be re-written to indicate the response rate and sampling method.
• Measurement instruments
  o The UWES had some good information but the presentation needs to be revised, e.g., the method of factor analysis needs to be more systematically presented. What aspects of validity were considered?
  o Academic achievement was reasonably well presented but language use needs to be checked.
• Procedure
  o Data is a plural entity.
  o Grammar use needs to be checked.
• Data analysis
  o The first sentence is not informative and could be removed.
  o Sentences two and three should be reversed.
  o As above authors need to check their use of grammar.

Results section:
• Paragraph one is confusing and I wasn’t sure about the F-statistics and what they meant? That is, which engagement dimension and academic results were the differences computed on?
• Table 2 –the authors need to reconfigure this so that the reader is aware of the rows (engagement dimensions?) and columns (academic results?).
• Table 4 is confusing and needs to be re-configured and the percentage of variation needs to be added. It appears that three separate regression analyses were done? I would remove the R–column and simplify the table to include the B,
SE B, & # values for each predictor.
- Table need to adhere to a standardised scientific format.

Discussion
- Grammar problems in language expression need to be remedied.
- I think a theoretical and pedagogical framework would make the discussion (and paper) more convincing.
- Implications for teaching practice need to be considered.
- Low correlation values need to be factored into explanations.

Conclusion
- Was the aim of the study achieved?
- Was the original research question (or hypothesis) answered?
- What are the major implications of this study?
- What is the scope for further research?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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