

### 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

Compulsory 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>
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.	This article describes a method to improve students' literacy, which is an exploratory discovery and is very good. However, there is considerable room for improvement in the clarity and logic of the article's expression. The structure of the article needs further optimization. Overall, while the research direction has certain practical value, the content of the article does not meet expectations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	The summary of the article is relatively comprehensive in terms of content, but its expression lacks clarity and logical structure, which needs improvement.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Unreasonable	
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.	<p>The topic of this article has certain practical value, but the demonstration process lacks some scientific rigor. The specific reasons are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Research Purpose and Background:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 The article mentions developing an LIP learning model based on the local potential of Taba Vulcan Gamalama. Could you elaborate more on why this specific volcano was chosen as the research subject? What are the specific aspects of its unique local potential?</li> <li>1.2 The article cites multiple sources indicating that Indonesian students have low chemistry literacy, but it does not explain the connections between these sources in detail. Could you systematically explain how these references support the research background and purpose?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Research Methodology:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 The article mentions using a descriptive qualitative research method but does not provide detailed operational steps. Could you explain in detail how the observations, questionnaires, and discussions were specifically implemented? For example, the specific content of the observations, the design and distribution process of the questionnaires, and the specific topics and formats of the discussions.</li> <li>2.2 Regarding sample selection, the article mentions using the saturation sample technique. Could you explain why this technique was chosen? Is there a specific reason to believe that a sample of 52 students is sufficient to represent the overall situation?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Data Analysis:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1 In the results section, Table 1 provides data from the field study but does not explain in detail how these data were collected and analyzed. Could you provide a more detailed analysis process and data sources?</li> <li>3.2 The data analysis section mainly consists of descriptive statistics, lacking in-depth analysis and discussion. For example, although it mentions that most students find chemistry difficult, there is no further analysis of the specific reasons and background for this phenomenon. Could you provide a more in-depth discussion and analysis?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The formatting of the references is disorganized and the sources are outdated. It is recommended to carefully format the references and use the most recent sources available to make the article more persuasive.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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:	Ling Zhang
Department, University & Country	Jiangxi University of Technology, China