

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_122765
Title of the Manuscript:	LEARNING MODEL OF WRITING SCIENTIFIC PAPERS BASED ON MOODLE LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, INDONESIAN LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM, PANCASAKTI UNIVERSITY OF MAKASSAR
Type of the Article	<b>Quantitative Study:</b> writing scientific papers in the pretest and posttest which were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	The author use excellent procedure for analyzing the data "writing scientific papers in the pretest and posttest which were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics". The article requires some major revision on the method and introduction section. The problem statement and research questions are not clear. Additionally, the method section needs subtitles too.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Based on my perspective, the title is long and wording. The author can make it concise and eye catching. It is very long.	
<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 author wrote structured abstract which missed many components of the structured abstract such as background, conclusion and problem statement. The abstract is conducive for research paper because it attracts the readers. Does the abstract include a few sentences about background? Does the abstract include a few sentences about research method? Does the abstract include problem statement? Bring major revision on the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The introduction section has to explore the background, problem statement and some literature review. The ideas should be synthesis perfectly through using transitional words. The conclusion section requires major revision; the author did not mention limitation of the study clearly. The author used many unnecessary bullet points which make reading boring for the readers. Develop the method section. The author have to state the research method, data collection tools, data analyse procedure clearly in the method section. Which software's is used for analyzing the data?	
<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>	After some major challenges the author will be sound good. The author did not consider APA style effectively; they use reporting verbs in the simple present tenses.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	In-text citation is not according to APA style. Use reporting verbs in simple past tense.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The article should be developed according to the Academic English rules. The writer (s) must review the abstract section of the article. The manuscript has shortage to transitions words, flow and coherence	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The topic is good but the manuscript requires carefully revision. It is better to review the article for English language. There is some technical problem in the article. Generally the article is good. The author should review some article from the Journal and prepare the format based on the published articles. Introduction: Hook the Reader with the first sentence. Start by broadly giving the background of the study and then introducing the variables. Divide the Research method into sub-sections. For example, Design, Sources of Data and Techniques for Searching, Data Cleaning, Data Analyses and Visualization	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<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>Pervaiz Yaseeni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nangarhar University, Afghanistan</b>