ReviewForm3

Journal Name:	AsianJournalofEducationandSocialStudies
ManuscriptNumber:	**Ms_AJESS_126277**
Title ofthe Manuscript:	**Guided Inquiry:An Alternative Science Learning Technique in Improving Elementary SchoolStudents' Process Skillsand ConceptMastery**
Type ofthe Article	

PART1:Review Comments

CompulsoryREVISION comments	**Reviewer'scomment**	**Author's Feedback***(Please correctthe manuscriptand highlightthatpart inthe manuscript.Itis mandatorythat authors should writehis/herfeedback here)*
Please writea few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community.Why do youlike (or dislike) this manuscript?A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscriptaddressesa valuable topic in science education—usingguidedinquiry to enhance younglearners' science process skills(SPS) and conceptmastery. However, its impactis limitedby severalweaknesses, includingalack of practicalrecommendationsfor educators andinsufficienttheoreticaldepth, which reducesits broader applicability.While itcontributes to understanding inquiry-based methods in early education,the manuscriptrequires substantialrefinementto effectivelysupportits claims and offer actionableinsights.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Thetitle,"Guided Inquiry:An AlternativeScience Learning Technique in Improving Elementary School Students' Process Skills and Concept Mastery," is generally suitable asitreflects the study's focus on guided inquiry andits educational impact on elementarystudents. However,itcould be more preciseto capturethe study's specific contextand objectives.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some pointsin this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstractis generally comprehensive,asitcoversthe study's aims,methodology,and key findings.However, itcould benefitfrom additional specificityregardingthe sample size, setting, and specificimprovements observedin science process skills (SPS) and concept mastery.Includingthese detailswould enhance clarityand providea more complete overview for readers. Suggested Revision:(1) Additionof Specific Sample Information:Mentioningthe sample size and demographic (i.e., third-grade students in Jambi, Indonesia) willgive readersa clearer context forthe study's scope.(2) Clarificationof Key Findings:Specify the exactimprovements in SPS and conceptmastery (e.g., percentage increase or "moderate improvement")for clarity ontheimpact of guidedinquiry.(3) Focus on Practical Implications:Briefly highlighthow the findings mightbe appliedin classroom settings or influenceteaching practicesto enhancethe abstract'srelevance for practitioners.	
Are subsectionsand structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is mostly appropriate,with clear sections forintroduction,methodology,results, discussion,and conclusion.However, separatingthe literaturereview from study objectivesin the introduction and organizing results by specific skills (e.g., "Observation," "Concept Mastery")would enhance clarity.Adding a subsectionon "PracticalImplications"in the conclusion could also strengthen the manuscriptby providing actionableinsights for educators.	
Please writea 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.	While the manuscriptuses a quasi-experimentaldesign with N-gain and T-testanalysesto measure changesin students'skills,its scientificrobustnessis limitedby some weaknesses. The methods section lacks detailon how the guidedinquiry model was specifically adapted for younglearners, which raises questions about the intervention's developmentalappropriateness. Additionally, whilestatisticalsignificanceisreported,the manuscriptdoes notfully interpretwhatthese results meanin practicalterms for elementary education. Addressing these gaps would enhancethe manuscript'stechnicalsoundness and relevance to educators.	

Are the references sufficientand recent? If you have suggestions of additionalreferences, please mention theminthe review form. **-**	The referencesin the manuscriptare somewhatsufficient,covering foundationalstudies on science process skills (SPS) and guided inquiry. However, many references are slightly outdated,with few sources from the past two to three years.Including morerecent studies, especially on guidedinquiry applicationsin elementaryeducation, would strengthen the manuscript'srelevance.I suggestincorporatingrecentresearch on early science education and inquiry-based learning methods to provide an updated perspective and reinforce the study's context within current educationaltrends.	

ReviewForm3

Is thelanguage/English quality ofthe article suitable for scholarly communications?	Thelanguage qualityofthe manuscriptis generally understandable butrequires refinementto meetscholarly standards. Certain sections,particularly the introductionand results,contain unclear phrasing and repetitive language, which may hinderreadability.For example, simplifying sentences and ensuring consistentterminology would improve clarity.Additionally,addressing minorgrammaticalerrors and enhancing transitionsbetween ideas would makethe manuscript more professional and suitablefor scholarly communication.	

Optional/Generalcomments	The manuscript investigates the application of guided inquiry as an instructional approach for enhancing science process skills (SPS) and concept mastery among third-grade elementary students in Jambi, Indonesia. Employing a quasi-experimental design, the study measures SPS and concept mastery through pretest and posttest scores, analyzed via N-gain and Ttests. While the study attempts to validate guided inquiry for young learners and presents findings indicating moderate improvements, there are several areas where the manuscript would benefit from refinement. Comments The study's relevance to contemporary science education is commendable, as it addresses the need for student-centered learning models and presents guided inquiry as an alternative. Additionally, the quasi-experimental design, along with statistical methods such as N-gain and T-test analyses, are appropriate for assessing the effects of the intervention. However, the manuscript's strengths are not fully realized due to a lack of detail in methodology, limited theoretical grounding, and insufficient consideration of the sample's generalizability. Below are the main areas needing improvement. 1. Results and Data Interpretation: While the data tables illustrate some degree of improvement across SPS and concept mastery indicators, the narrative descriptions following these tables lack depth and clarity. For example, in describing the data collection indicator, the authors state, "This means that the average increase in SPS in the data collection ability indicator in science learning using guided inquiry is 'moderate" (Results and Discussion). This statement would benefit from a clearer explanation of what "moderate" improvement implies for students' actual performance. A more detailed analysis could explore the types of skills students developed and discuss whether this "moderate" increase is significant enough to support guided inquiry as an effective model. 2. Weaknesses in Theoretical Foundation: The literature review provides a brief background on SPS and guided inquiry but fails to thoroughly examine the unique aspects of guided inquiry as compared to other instructional models. Without a deeper theoretical comparison, the rationale for selecting guided inquiry as the intervention method appears underdeveloped. Additionally, the discussion on SPS could be improved by incorporating insights into how these skills are foundational to higher-order thinking and lifelong learning in science. Expanding on the theoretical justification and contextualizing guided inquiry within current trends in early science education would provide readers with a clearer understanding of its value. 3. Lack of Specific Adaptations for Elementary Students: The manuscript implies that guided inquiry can be adapted to younger learners but does not elaborate on specific modifications made to suit third-grade students. As elementary students may have limited cognitive and literacy skills compared to older students, it would be beneficial to clarify how the model was adapted to accommodate these developmental differences. For example, the study could detail any simplifications in vocabulary, step-by-step guidance, or visual aids used. As it stands, the study lacks evidence that the approach was customized to align with the needs of young learners, which could impact its effectiveness and applicability. 4. Sample Limitations and Generalizability: The study's sample, drawn from two locations within the same school system, is small and context-specific, limiting the findings' generalizability. The authors state that "Guided Inquiry can be used as an alternative to improve students' mastery of science concepts in science learning" (Conclusion). However, this conclusion would be strengthened if the authors addressed the limitations of their sample and discussed how the intervention might vary across different educational settings or student demographics. Acknowledging these limitations and suggesting future studies involving larger and more diverse samples would improve the study's validity. 5. Structure and Language Precision: Some sections of the manuscript would benefit from restructuring for greater clarity. For instance, the Introduction contains general statements about the importance of education quality improvements, such as "One real effort to improve the quality of education is through curriculum development and implementation of student-oriented learning." Simplifying and focusing on these statements would improve readability. Moreover, the Results and Discussion sections could be better organized by aligning each SPS indicator and mastery concept with a corresponding discussion, enhancing coherence. 6. Insufficient Implications and Recommendations: The manuscript concludes that guided inquiry effectively improves SPS and concept mastery for third graders, yet it lacks detailed practical recommendations for educators. Concrete	

ReviewForm3

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ronald L. Reyes**
Department, University & Country	**School of Science and Technology, Centro Escolar University, Philippines**