

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_107735
Title of the Manuscript:	Development Design of Current Career Guidance Service Model in Makassar Aviation Polytechnic
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 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>1. The manuscript is not contributing knowledge to the community because it is just presenting the result of the validation of three materials, which could be done as just one of the activity in research, leading to a deeper one. More so, there were no glimpse of the materials validated, so the readers are at lost in connecting the validation presentation with the materials being validated. The study does not contribute knowledge to the reading public because the three materials being validated, namely (Career Development Model), (2) Career Guidance Modules, and (3) Talent Mapping Assessment, are not all visible to the readers.</p> <p>2. The title is promising, but the content does not sustain the title.</p> <p>3. The abstract could have begun with the introduction and rationale to provide the reason for the conduct of the research, and not with the purpose.</p> <p>4. There is no Part 2. From 1. Introduction, it proceeded to 3. Methods.</p> <p>5. The conclusion is not in consonance with the results and findings. The Results and Findings just focus on the presentation of validation of three materials. But the conclusion states something like this, "The results of this activity show that the ability of cadets and cadets in preparing th. eir careers is quite good. As many as 34.62 per cent of cadets and cadets obtained very good assessment results, 54.81 per cent obtained good category results, and the remaining 10.58 per cent obtained quite good results." This conclusion is impossible to be deducted from the discussion of findings.</p> <p>6. Mahapatra, 2022 on page 3 is not found in the Reference list. Indonesia in figures, 2020 on page 1 is not found in the Reference list. Theses, 2021 on page 3 is not found in the Reference list. Lawler, 2019 on page 2 is not found in Reference list. Since four in-text citations are already found not in the Reference list, it is possible that there are still some in-text citation that are also not in the Reference list.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use of comma in the average rating, for example "3,8", wherein it should have been "3.8", is confusing to the reader, because it seems two numbers "3" and "8".</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>* The General Assessment (Validation) numerical rating of A, B, C and D is confusing, because in the table, 1 is directly above A, 2 is directly above B, 3 is directly above C, so on and so forth. So, if the General Assessment (Validation) is A, it means "1". But in truth, A is equivalent to "4".</p> <p>* The Methods portion stated that there is primary and secondary data. This primary and secondary data should be presented in Results and Discussion. Considering that the primary data is the validation rating, it is the secondary data which is not presented.</p> <p>* The number of respondents is not declared.</p> <p>* In the three tables, aside from mean, standard deviation should also be presented.</p> <p>* Some entries in the Reference list does not follow the latest APA format, specifically, some journal sources are not italicized.</p> <p>* Results and Discussion is not appropriate to be started with in-text citations.</p> <p>* The first sentence in Part 3. Methods has a number 9 written inside a bracket "[9]". This numbering is not known. If it is a citation count, the manuscript does not apply the citation numbering in its body.</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:	Elymar A. Pascual
Department, University & Country	Philippines