

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102425
Title of the Manuscript:	Science Practicum Assessment on 21st Century Skills: Systematic Literature Review
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important</p> <p>2. You have to specify it. I believe that the title does not clearly express the search for the article. I recommend that you incorporate those who participate in the evaluation, students and teachers, into the teaching-learning process. Well, as it is stated, it seems that the evaluation is related to scientific practice and not to the teaching/learning process of scientific practice.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is complete.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct. Although he does not mention it, he is inspired by a teaching-learning perspective (technological) and there are others (constructivists). But he is consistent in his choice.</p> <p>6. I consider that the references are pertinent</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the quality seems adequate. Perhaps I would revise the use of punctuation.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leivas Marcela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina</b>