

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_91932
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPROVING STUDENTS' SCIENCE PROCESS SKILLS USING ARGUMENT-DRIVEN-INQUIRY (ADI) LABORATORY METHOD
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the introduction, the length is literally short. To improve the introduction, add more ideas about the topic by dissecting the topic in a detailed manner. Starts with what is the study is all about, a brief history or recap about the topic and why it is important and described the present status or situation regarding the topic. Also, add citations and/or references in making the introduction since all the facts and reports were from a source. To make the story short, make a total renovation/improvement in the introduction.</p> <p>In the methodology, explain the sampling, the reason why only the 4<sup>th</sup> year students were the respondents and why the sections mentioned were the respondents. Since it is a quasi-experimental research design and one of the objectives is to determine if there is a significant difference in the developed science process skills among students exposed to ADI and those exposed to the traditional laboratory when they are classified based on their reasoning ability levels, the researcher must explain or prove that the two groups (experimental and control group) were comparable to each other. For instance, if the control group were more active and/or have higher academic performance than the experimental group, then the two groups cannot be compared to each other since the possible outcome would be the control group tend to get higher score/rating regardless if they were not exposed to the intervention. However, if the result were in favor to group the experimental, the question would be if there is any other factors which may affect the performance of the experimental group and to what extend do the intervention helps them to surpass the control group. Explain how the researchers address the ethical considerations, how the research instrument were developed and how the data will be analyzed and the statistical treatment to be used.</p> <p>For the result, table 1 and 2 show the result of the test before the intervention, however, another table should be used to compare the result to show or prove that the two groups were comparable or the difference (if there is) in their performance had no significant difference to each other. The reason for this is that the two groups must be the same in order to establish the credibility of the result assuming the experimental group will get a higher ratings/score and it can be associated to the intervention they received.</p> <p>The conclusion may have the point to claim that the use of the said intervention can really improve the academic performance of the respondents. However, it is still necessary to establish that the two groups were almost same, The question could be that the experimental group were great the control group which may suggest that there is an improvement not because of the intervention but because of the respondents' adaptability to cope up with the challenge. Again, an additional tables and data to show the comparison of the two groups were highly recommended.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Add more literature in the paper	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Check the format of the paper (if there is) and follow the given template of the Journal where it is intended to be submitted	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

<b><u>Name:</u></b>	<b><u>Jomell M. Santiago</u></b>
<b><u>Department, University &amp; Country</u></b>	<b><u>Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Philippines</u></b>