

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_118622
Title of the Manuscript:	Empowerment of Local Communities in the Survival of Multicultural Values: Case Study in Tana Toraja Village, East Kutai
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>The introduction part is too long. It didn't have competing Interests part.</p> <p>Yes, it is, but the method and results need to be revised.</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient and up to date but I think that the format of referencing in the text isn't true for example in first paragraph of introduction the references 1 to 5 showed separately.</p> <p>Which method did you use for qualitative analysis? Which software did you use? The results of the study especially themes and subthemes must be showed as a table. Add descriptive results to your study as a table (for example how many participants were in your study, what are their age and sex and so on). Is your questionnaire a researcher-made one? Add it as supplementary.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications but it is better the authors use more comma and colon to separate the sentences because the absence or incorrect use of these symbols in some parts of the article confuses the reader</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article need structural check.</p>	

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)
<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:	Marita Mohammadshahi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran