

## 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	EMPIRICAL STUDY

### 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 REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as the study used the current technology as an alternative for learning.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Need to revise the way the "significance of the study" and research question were presented in the manuscript. Please relocate those two subsections to a suitable subsection. In addition, please revise the LR section – lack of synthesis within the LR. Furthermore, you need to revise the methodology section. Remove the "textbook" components and be more specific of the method applied in your research.</p> <p>Yes Most of the references are from more than 5 years ago. In addition, some references listed were not found in the text, and vice-versa, and the reference mentioned in the text was not the same as those listed in the reference list.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	Simple and easy to understand English language was used.	
<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zuraini Mat Issa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia</b>