

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_109524
Title of the Manuscript:	On-site Learning in Museums: Re-conceptualizations and Re-directions for Museum Education in the Post-pandemic Digital Age
Type of the Article	Manuscript

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Allow reader/learner to observe and provides factual data that are used to create laws or theories about various aspects of society Also help understand how events in the past made things the way they are today. With lessons from the past, not only learn about us and how we came to be, but also develop the ability to avoid mistakes and create better paths for our societies.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not really. Too long intro/background of study (ideal state). Make it short and precise. Highlight the main concern/problem statement (current state). Main aims and objectives need to be highlighted. Method/approach or reviewing previous literatures need to be justified. Scope of study/research should be mentioned too. Highlight main finding and significance of this study (consequence state).</p> <p>Not really. Introduction – typo. Split into subsection (require renumbering) such as research background/overview, current state (problem) or main issues related to on-site learning.</p> <p>Subsection Museum and Museum communication and Museum Education – try to compress by highlighting main ideas.</p> <p>Subsection main aims/objective of this study/review of literature is hard to find and clearly stated. Express in table where and when possible.</p> <p>How the subsection cultural and identity reflect main title?</p> <p>Does interaction can be highlighted as a part of subsection in improving on-site learning.</p> <p>In order to guarantee that readers fully comprehend the scope of the researchers' study, the technical information have to be clarified and increased.</p> <p>Seem too long (large number of pages) – manuscript need to be revised if try to meet publisher requirement. Avoid “theses like” or report format.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. But should be primary research from the past 2 – 5 years.</p> <p>Should consist of the essential points. you focus on what is fundamental for the current study. In other words, it's not helpful to recommend additional work that would be considered the “next step” in the study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Method - Provides advice on how to choose the tuning parameters, presents further intuition supporting the validity of the framework, and illustrates the method's performance on a practical numerical example.</p> <p>Provide balanced view of contents and reflect the main topic.</p> <p>Provide subsection conclusion- revisit and it should reflect with main aims/objective to be achieved including significant contribution.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The manuscript has a thorough literature review, but the introduction should define the important terms.</p> <p>This is an interesting study, however if it can be compressed and split into interesting subsection more meaningful. Section and Subsection might be useful and could help to keep the manuscript in a short format. Given these shortcomings the manuscript requires minor revisions. I propose breaking up the analysis into multiple subsections to make the paper easier to read.</p> <p>The manuscript offers a unique contribution and is supported by compelling empirical evidence (review of previous literature). It just needs a few little changes to be published. I believe that they can put forward their arguments much more confidently.</p> <p>This work is really promising, and I really loved reading it. At the same time, I saw a number of problems that need to be addressed by the writers such as key finding base on previous work and how it should reflect with main title and provide significance contribution.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reword this line/sentence: Subsection “tenets and Suggestion” is that there is still a digital divide.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nor Arzami Othman
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia