

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_99011
Title of the Manuscript:	Learning Activity Packets (LAPs) in Personal Development for Senior High School
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 for 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. The manuscript is essential for the scientific community. This article shows the steps in developing Learning Activity Packets (LAPs) for high school. It could be a reference for others who are interested in developing related materials.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable. But it would be clearer if the title is as follow:</p> <p>“The Development of Learning Activity Packets (LAPs) in Personal Development for Senior High School.”</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, the background of the study seems to be missing in the manuscript. Please provide some past studies encouraging the author to conduct the current research. The content under the Statement of the Problem subsection is more to Research Objectives. Can the author please elaborate on the problem statement and change the “Statement of the Problem” heading to “Objectives”?</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but some elements are missing. It would be better if the author could include the following:</p> <p>(i) Recommendation and limitations of the study. (ii) Are there any solutions or suggestions provided in the subsection on the Scope and Delimitations of the Study? (iii) What was the sampling method used? (iv) The range of interval scores and their corresponding descriptive interpretation was based on which study? Who proposed the interpretation?</p> <p>6. The references are recent but insufficient. The author could include more past studies and references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The results were well-addressed.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Low Jie Ying
Department, University & Country	Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia