

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_112836
Title of the Manuscript:	Designing a Learning Model with a Contextual Teaching Learning Approach Based on the Flipped Classroom to Improve Science Understanding
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes it is very important it will address the gap of the area of research in the right way of understanding science and make the learner have readiness to learn</p> <p>2. The topic is suitable since the topic is trying to address the gap of those learners that have a challenge understanding science concepts and how they can improve since learners have diverse way of understanding concept.</p> <p>3. According to my understanding the abstract is a brief summary of the whole research and according to the researcher he has very brief information. Researcher has a very lengthy introduction there are main areas left out which are appearing to the document very well. I propose to state theory used the findings to be clearly stated and the contribution toward world of knowledge this will make the document clearly understood otherwise this is a very good study with a lot of insight and the insight will be clearly be seen in the abstract.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is okay if incorporate the above information in number 3</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is correct</p> <p>6. the reference are okay current and well address in APA format except there is mix-up of the use of and & in the reference and in the document itself when quoting the reference example under introduction, (Sutomo & Fathurrahman, 2019), (Athani & Rupa 2020), (Bujuri & Baiti 2019), (Aningsih & Zahrani 2019) should use "and " and not & also the references has mixed the and & must be consistent the document need some editing</p> <p>All information in introduction should at least have some heading it has carried a lot at least sub topic like purpose of study statement of problem, theoretical framework research theory but in summarised form. All this information are in the documents but no subtitles for them all are included in the introduction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>it suitable for scholarly work</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is good and it has minor corrected especially on abstracts and sub-heading the rest is a wonderful contribution. if well address the document is good for adding knowledge to the globe</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:	John Gathage Kunga
Department, University & Country	Machakos University, Kenya