

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121411
Title of the Manuscript:	PRELIMINARY STUDY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIP LEARNING MODEL BASED ON THE LOCAL POTENTIAL OF TABA VULKAN GAMALAMA FOR IMPROVING STUDENTS CHEMICAL LITERACY
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses the significant issue of chemical literacy among students in Indonesia, specifically through the development of a Learning Inquiry Project (LIP) model incorporating local geological features. The use of Taba Vulkan Gamalama's local potential as a foundation for enhancing educational methods in chemistry is innovative and culturally relevant.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title accurately reflects the manuscript's content and objectives. However, it could be more concise. A suggested revision could be: "Developing a Gamalama Volcano-Inspired LIP Model to Enhance Chemical Literacy."	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract provides a clear overview of the research objectives, methods, and preliminary findings. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the specific educational outcomes or improvements observed, if any, to provide a complete snapshot of the research impact. Additionally, the abstract should clarify that the LIP model is still under development, as the current phrasing might suggest completed results.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections are generally well-organized, following a logical flow from introduction to methods, results, and discussion. Each section is adequately detailed, providing enough background to understand the research context and findings. However, the transition between the results and discussion could be more seamless, with clearer connections drawn between observed data and theoretical implications.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with a clear methodological approach using descriptive qualitative analysis. The integration of local environmental features into a learning model is a sound strategy for increasing relevance and engagement in educational settings. However, the research would benefit from a more rigorous statistical analysis to quantify improvements in chemical literacy, if applicable.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are current and relevant, supporting the manuscript's claims and providing a solid foundation for the study. Additional references from similar studies in other geographical or cultural contexts could enrich the comparative analysis and provide broader insights into the applicability of the LIP model globally.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language of the article is generally clear but needs some editing for grammar and style to reach the standard for scholarly communication. For instance, there are several instances of awkward phrasing and typographical errors that could be corrected to improve readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Asma Hadyaoui</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sousse University, Tunisia</b>