

## 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The paper is scientifically sound, conceptually meaningful, and accurately designed and written. It is a qualitative analysis, on the whole.</p> <p>The title is suitable with respect of the contents of the paper. The abstract is coherent and comprehensible.</p> <p>Subsections are all appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript seems to be scientifically correct, there are no major problems or inconsistencies.</p> <p>The references are recent and suitable.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>Language quality is acceptable, but there are some issues to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in some instances, phrases might be reformulated, such as:</li> <li>- page 1 – Abstract: "the interview has in it [contains] the list..."</li> <li>- page 2 – confusion between "its" and "it's" (it's indigenous knowledge...)</li> </ul> <p>Some phrases are too long and repetitive (see first paragraphs of the introduction), they should be split into shorter phrases.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This is a very well-written and very coherent paper, but longer phrases should be shortened. From a conceptual and scientific point of view, the study deserves to be published, it is very well conceived and devised.</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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alina Andreea Dragoescu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Michael I", Romania</b>