

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <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>Yes, the manuscript is important for Indigenous Education and the scientific community. The title is suitable, but it could be improved upon to capture a little about what the authors have done. I suggest including Development and Validation of C-LRM....</p> <p>The abstract is too wordy and not properly structured.</p> <p>Too many subheadings. The authors even referred to some sections as chapters.</p> <p>The authors need to improve on several aspects of the manuscript to make the manuscript to be scientifically correct. For example, they should rework the claim that primary data was sourced from literature in paragraph 4 under Research Design. Also, several questions need to be answered on the content of the new instructional package, research design, and methodology. Some of the questions include how does the newly developed and validated instructional material align with Bloom's taxonomy?</p> <p>Was informed consent obtained for the participants in the FGD? How many people participated in the FGD?</p> <p>Were there incentives? Why did the authors use an interview guide to conduct a focus group discussion? (Some of these questions were answered but the answers were not in the methodology section).</p> <p>Validation of the instrument could have been done with Cronbach alpha statistics. Did the authors also conduct a reliability test?</p> <p>Qualitative analysis of data from the focus group discussion would have been helpful. References need to adopt the APA formatting style.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The language of the manuscript is scholarly, but it needs editing.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>In my view, the aspect of the article on the problem statement, research design methodology, results, and discussion are too short while too much irrelevant information on the content of the newly developed instructional package filled up the space. The authors need to say more about the problem of the study, the way the research was conducted, and the findings. Most parts of the manuscript were on the topics in the newly designed learning material.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Oladotun Opeoluwa Olagbaju |
| Department, University & Country | Legacy University, The Gambia |