

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_120292
Title of the Manuscript:	Project-Based Learning Model for Freestyle Swimming Education at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Megarezky
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The initiative of the study (developing a model) would scientifically benefit the field of swimming education. This manuscript drew my attention with its intriguing initiative.</p> <p>Initially, the research objective is to develop a PBL model. However, in the "Result" section, the author laid focus on evaluating a model rather than developing a model. The outcomes of the study do not address the research objective. The failure in addressing the research objective impacts the significance of the study.</p> <p>It is necessary to make improvements to the information presentation, as many statements were provided with only brief explanations that lacked supporting evidence from relevant literature.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is addressing the research objective. However, the outcomes of this study do not adhere to the title and objective.</p> <p>This study is more to validating/evaluating a model. Still, not detail enough to present this viewpoint.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive enough since the author did not clearly explain the background and problem statement of the study. The organisation of abstract needs improvement as the author mentioned "findings" before "methodology". The implication of the study is vague, kindly refine.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript needs improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please include literature review section in your manuscript. 2. Results and discussion should be separated into two different sections. 3. I suggest the author to include the suitable subsections for "Method" to improve its readability. Such as research design, participants, data collection, instruments, data analysis...This manuscript severely lacks detailed explanations for each subsection. 	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust if the outcomes adhere to the research objective. Both developing a model or evaluating a model are technically significant to the field of swimming education. Unfortunately, the focus of this manuscript is vague which impact the scientific correctness of the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references are not sufficient for supporting the facts/statement/discussion. The references should be filtered so that they are suitably supporting the facts/statement/discussion. The references should adhere to the proper format.</p> <p>The references are recent.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Proofread is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are some statements require further explanation & literature support (e.g., Introduction 2nd par.). It is important to relate the previous research outcomes with your study to highlight the significance of your study.2. The problem statement of your study was not systematically written. Kindly amend.3. The Introduction was not well-organised. The facts and statements that supporting each other should be put together to strengthen your explanation of the study.4. Some “proves” or supporting literature included in this study are not suitable/related to your study. Kindly include the suitable proves.5. The results do not address the research objectives.6. The discussion is lacking literature support.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leow Min Hui
Department, University & Country	University Teknologi MARA, Malaysia