

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102968
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of YouTube as a Supplementary Material to Enhance the Students' Learning Achievement in Geography
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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This manuscript is important enough to increase our insight and perspective on the use of YouTube as a learning medium</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>Authors are expected to adjust to the journal template or read the journal that has been published by AJESS, and the number of words in the article exceeds 6000 words, please reduce it according to the maximum number of words suggested</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The introduction of the paper is well designed in line with the title of paper</p> <p>2. The literature review is comprehensive and up to date</p> <p>3. Methodological aspects of the study clearly constructed clearly</p> <p>4. Data analysis is presented clearly systematically</p> <p>5. The results are discussed very well and compiled with conclusion</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukris Sutyatno
Department, University & Country	STMik Bina Patria, Indonesia