

This study discusses an interesting topic about teacher feedback regarding EFL learners' written performance in a region where research in this area is close to nothing. It shows a good deal of originality coupled with reliance on qualitative methodology to broach the topic, which is pretty challenging. This project merits publication only if the author(s) exert serious effort to apply a major revision as to formatting, wording/paragraphing, and methodological issues to make the report more approachable to the reader.

General remarks

- One major issue with this paper is that it has not been formatted according to international standards of paper writing. A cursive review gives me the impression that it has been excerpted from a manuscript in fulfillment of an academic report (MA perhaps). For example, the first three subsections: background, statement of the problem, and research questions could be fused into one section the authors may term 'Introduction'
- Paragraphing: there is no consistency in terms of paragraph size (e.g., parag line 58 comes in a sentence. Basic parag layout should include a topic sentence and supporting ideas, which I rarely notice in this manuscript. It is highly advised that the author(s) rewrite/blend/omit paragraphs to make them more reader-friendly.
- In section 'Statement of the Problem', author(s) need to give more elucidation about the issue broached. For instance, they should clarify what is to be enhanced in students' written renderings. Added to this, they should include more arguments to build the case for their rationale.
- The '**Theoretical Framework section**' makes more sense if relocated to the end of the Literature review section. The reader might follow a line of logic that would naturally narrow down to the model in focus.
- One major issue is info about the sample. Now that author(s) relied on a qualitative platform, the minimal detail would avail in the interpretation as well as the quality of the results. It is mandatory to illuminate the readers about the informants of this part of the world wherein we know little about the EFL experience.
- I am confused about the two-paragraph introd (lines 153-162) which should have been fused into one paragraph. I see them more fit in the instruments sections than being displayed as an introd.
- You mentioned 'An expert in the Graduate Education Department at Baraton University validated the data collection instruments and checked the content validity of the interview schedules' (Line 168). That sounds very rigorous. However, results about the validation process should be reported here (what are the assumptions tested, any violations documented, any results of external validation; data credibility since the study is qualitatively oriented, etc.)
- I suggest the section "**Statistical Treatment of Data**" be omitted to avoid the trouble of providing additional information about (type of

statistics used, a sample of the data in focus and how was treated, data from 'content analysis', etc. as for the second paragraph, it is more into ethics than stats. I wish the author(s) encapsulate it into the section of ethics which in term should be succinct and be part of the data collection section. It is worth reminiscing that a quality research defends itself.

- Instruments section: authors should give full account of the composition exercise books which are fundamental to our understanding of the data being collected
- In the results part 1, participants (seven) should be given a code name so that we can follow who is saying what. Intrapersonal patterns could be detected as well accordingly.
- In the results part 2, I wish the author(s) devote an introductory paragraph to the section to display objectives and analytic procedures. This may add clarity for the reader. Also a concluding paragraph would be relevant.
- In the results part 3, the *six plus one method* of Gamarra (2014) should have been explicitly elucidated in the literature part of the paper or perhaps in the methodology part, specifically the design of the study. Author(s) should justify the use of this model and not another one. We should not wait until this point of the manuscript to learn about this taxonomy.
- In the results part 4, I have problem reading the samples displayed. They are illegible, untitled, and hardly elucidating. They should be appended instead.
- In the results part 5, where is the discussion part? If the author(s) chose to integrate it while reporting the results, this has added more confusion where I can hardly follow when they are reporting and when reflecting on the data. Dividing the two tasks is believed a necessity here.
- In the results part 6, it is better to use subtitles to replace the dubs of question 1 and Q2

Conclusion:

- This does not follow the international standards of concluding. Kindly use prosaic style in the summary part. I noticed that the points a to d are hardly related to the topic. What is the value added here? I wish authors remove this or instead justify it.
- The same remark above applies to the recommendations part.

Here are some miscellaneous points worth discussing:

TITLE

I suggest part of title be omitted to curb redundancy and add more visibility to the paper “Second Language writing pedagogy in secondary schools, Bulilima, Zimbabwe”

Keywords: suggest Zimbabwe be omitted and other terms (document analysis) added

Abstract

- International standards stipulate abstracts be written in a one-paragraph block
 - Why should they mention the research questions in abstract?
 - Results ought to be succinct, too much information worth omitting
 - Some choice of vocabulary is impertinent (imperative, maximum benefit)
 - I am confused about whether the researcher is the teacher at the same time.
 - The implications sentence (22-23) should be more elaborate. What is the originality/add-on to the related literature and practice?)
- Omit paragraph starting from line 141. No need to be apologetic. As said earlier, try to ‘decontextualize’ the study as it is expected that it would benefit a broader context.

Some Language remarks

- Lines 29-39 The authors enlisted a series of unrelated info defining valuing feedback...This part is to be omitted and get straight to the point starting from Line 40. No one will blame them for not defining feedback as the literature abounds with it.
- Author(s) invited to use simple statements and avoid complex, yet suffocating, phrases such as ‘This research therefore sought to conduct an investigation’ Line 62
- Line 72 “identifies the particular properties” what is meant by properties?
- Line 79 “composition writing” please reverse order to writing composition (mistakes as such are intolerable at this level)
- Same remark as above with the topic sentence Line 83. (Related literature and studies were reviewed in order to buttress this study) Sentences may do harm than good to the stylistic quality of the writing. Omit
- The next sentence “studies....studied” ???
- Line 86 he gathered???
- Line 89 “to find out what works.” Give more details about this statement.
- Acronym EFL (line 107) was used before in line 91

Paragraph starting from line 147 is irrelevant if not redundant, plus the awkwardness of the style (shows information on feedback as well as research

- 148 finding on feedback worldwide !!!). I suggest it be omitted.
-
- Basic errors to be avoided (e.g., the internet L. 143) to be capitalized
- Line 210. Avoid use of “I” also try to avoid informal wording (I got information)
- Nielsen (2015) page needed here Line 134
- One participant the author(s) missed to highlight: the teacher. In a qualitative research as such research assistants should be experts in conducting a study with such delicacy. We need to know about the research/practice profile of the teacher/assistant, whether s/he underwent special training, the difficulties she me, etc.
- Line 184, since the author(s) mentioned “coding and analysis” would it be possible if they disclose their coding scheme or show a demonstration of a sample dataset treated by such scheme and whether they can report it in an appendix?
- Line 262 clip???. This is a sample not a clip. By the way I can hardly read the content.

- Line 266, I noticed the frequent use of the preposition “On” meaning with respect to or regarding. Avoid use of this term often used in a spoken mode.
- As I said above, there is a sudden shift from addressing reader through third person to first-person referring to those who conduct the study. Be consistent.
-