

**Editor's comment:**

Please pay attention to the comments listed below.

It is better to avoid the use of abbreviations such as WW2 without first writing them in full.

Some English errors remain and should be corrected before publishing. For example, in the first paragraph: leaning changed instead of learning changed.

In some cases, there is a clear lack of reference to support claims which remain vague. For example, in the second paragraph: "...many now view literary texts as providing rich linguistic input..." Please elaborate on who has such a view.

Sentences such as "Rural secondary school students indicate that to attain objectives of literature components of courses, texts require due consideration, and in the context of Malaysian rural classrooms, for the reader-text interactive process to emerge between students and teachers, thus prompting student schemata" should be supported by a reference.

Grammar mistakes remain. For example: "According to Brown, [for] many English students, the term English Literature would connote difficult books predominant in libraries ~~but which~~ [that] have scarce readership".

One of the reviewer's requested that the authors include the strengths and limitations of the systematic review method. Unfortunately, the revised text no longer presents a systematic/critical review of the literature which was the strength of this manuscript. Instead, the authors opted to revise their text to include a narrative review of the literature.

It is advisable to proofread the work and to check for typing mistakes such as savoir etré instead of savoir être taken from Byram's work.

I believe that the title could be revised to better reflect the content of the article. I suggest that the words "literature review" as well as "in the Malaysian context" be added for the sake of clarity.

Overall, the text would be more readable without recourse to verbose forms and bombastic vocabulary.

**Author's Feedback:**

<b>No</b>	<b>Editor's comment:</b>	<b>Author's Rectification/ Justifications</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1.	It is better to avoid the use of abbreviations such as WW2 without first writing them in full.	Rectified as commented.	p. 2
2.	Some English errors remain and should be corrected before publishing. For example, in the first paragraph: leaning changed instead of learning changed.	Rectified as commented.	p. 2

<p>3. In some cases, there is a clear lack of reference to support claims which remain vague. For example, in the second paragraph: "...many now view literary texts as providing rich linguistic input..." Please elaborate on who has such a view.</p>	<p>Rectified as commented.</p>	<p>p. 2</p>
<p>4. Sentences such as "Rural secondary school students indicate that to attain objectives of literature components of courses, texts require due consideration, and in the context of Malaysian rural classrooms, for the reader-text interactive process to emerge between students and teachers, thus prompting student schemata" should be supported by a reference.</p>	<p>There is a reference given. Reference No. 25.</p>	<p>p. 4</p>
<p>5. Grammar mistakes remain. For example: "According to Brown, [for] many English students, the term English Literature would connote difficult books predominant in libraries <del>but which</del> [that] have scarce readership".</p>	<p>Rectified as commented.</p>	<p>p. 4</p>
<p>6. One of the reviewer's requested that the authors include the strengths and limitations of the systematic review method. Unfortunately, the revised text no longer presents a systematic/critical review of the literature which was the strength of this manuscript. Instead, the authors opted to revise their text to include a narrative review of the literature.</p>	<p>Noted. Narrative overview of the literature is one of the many means to probe existing patterns.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>7. It is advisable to proofread the work and to check for typing mistakes such as <i>savoir etré</i> instead of <i>savoir être</i> taken from Byram's work.</p>	<p>Rectified as commented.</p>	<p>p. 5</p>
<p>8. I believe that the title could be revised to better reflect the content of the article. I suggest that the words "literature review" as well as "in the Malaysian context" be added for the sake of clarity.</p>	<p>Rectified as commented.</p>	<p>p. 1</p>
<p>9. Overall, the text would be more readable without recourse to verbose forms and bombastic vocabulary.</p>	<p>Noted. Cogent illustrations of the context/ setting.</p>	<p>n/a</p>