

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	SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

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. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a timely and relevant topic: the future of on-site learning in museums in the digital age. The author provides a comprehensive overview of the existing literature on museum education and communication, and he proposes a new conceptual framework for understanding museums as sites for communication and learning. The manuscript is well-written and well-argued, and it makes a significant contribution to the field.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the main points of the manuscript, and it is clear and concise.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and easy to follow. The subsections are clearly labeled and relevant to the main points of the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The author cites relevant and recent literature to support his claims, and he argues his points in a clear and logical manner.</p> <p>6. Yes, the 56 references are sufficient and recent. The author cites a variety of sources, including books, articles, and websites. He also cites a number of recent sources, which suggests that he is up-to-date on the latest research in this area.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written and free of errors in grammar and spelling. The author uses a clear and concise writing style.</p>	<p>1.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written and informative. The author makes a significant contribution to the field of museum education and communication by proposing a new conceptual framework for understanding museums as sites for communication and learning. I would recommend this manuscript for publication in a scholarly journal.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Slavoljub J Hričenko
Department, University & Country	Univerity of Novi Sad, Serbia