

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_108561
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL TRAINING MODEL FOR TUTORS AT LEARNING ACTIVITY CENTERS IN ENREKANG REGENCY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, a model for tutors could be very usefull</p> <p>2. No. The title is about development but there is very less to read about the development itself. Even the product itself it not given. Only the effect.</p> <p>3. The abstract is too long and to many details.</p> <p>4. I mis a section about the theoretical background (TB). Especially DDDD and something about the tools. The method (RM) section must be extended. How is the product made, how does DDDD fit here and how are the decisions made (eg: when do you call something Very needy). I need a background in TB see how this led to the research methods and how you will come to conclusions. Then you present the results.</p> <p>5. The references are not found in the text and the refeence list is hard to read because of the layout.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The document need more information in order to be able to reproduce the study.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adri Dierdorp
Department, University & Country	Utrecht University, Netherland