

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99237
Title of the Manuscript:	Contextualized Learning Resource Material (C-LRM) for the Tingguians of Abra: Its Indigenous Knowledge, Systems, and Practices
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>This research can be considered relevant to the knowledge of a focused specific case study. However, this could be replicated in other geographical areas and even be extended to new research challenges. The title responds to the content of the paper, considering it appropriate.</p> <p>Although the abstract, in its first lines seems very clear, on the other hand, the same does not happen when it presents the results, therefore it is recommended to clarify this issue in the abstract.</p> <p>The manuscript is correctly written and responds to scientific parameters, however, there is less to clarify the results through figures or tables that allow readers to better understand. The references are adequate and generally quite up-to-date. It is recommended to review the format.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Although the abstract, in its first lines seems very clear, on the other hand, the same does not happen when it presents the results, therefore it is recommended to clarify this issue in the abstract.</p> <p>The manuscript is correctly written and responds to scientific parameters, however, there is less to clarify the results through figures or tables that allow readers to better understand. The references are adequate and generally quite up-to-date. It is recommended to review the format</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Mercedes Vernia Carrasco
Department, University & Country	Jaume I University, Spain