

## 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it highlights the empowerment efforts of the Tana Toraja community in East Kutai to preserve their multicultural values. This expands our knowledge of multiculturalism and empowerment and understanding of the subject.</li> <li>The title of the article is suitable.</li> <li>The abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>It would have been beneficial if the writer/s had included the literature review and theory sections.</li> <li>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>The references are sufficient and recent</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The methodology discusses interviews, but the discussion and findings section lacks verbatim from interviews that could support the arguments.</li> <li>Since recommendations are stated in the conclusion, including a recommendations section would be sufficient.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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:	Zimuto Nyasha Cefas
Department, University & Country	Rwanda