

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_86005
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENT WORKSHEETS WRITE PROJECT BASED LEARNING-BASED EXPLANATORY TEXT FOR CLASS XI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Abstract section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. LKPD must use the full form for the first time it is used. Non-standard abbreviations should be listed and the full form of each abbreviation should be given in parentheses at first use in the text. ii. In the research methods section, the author must state whether this study used a qualitative or quantitative method. iii. The significance of this study and its practical implications must also be mentioned in the abstract. <p>2. Introduction section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. This study's problem statements are unclear. The author must explain why this study is necessary. ii. Some of the statements in the manuscript should be cited. iii. Before the Methodology section, the author should include a Literature Review section to examine previous literature that is relevant to this study, such as the feasibility and effectiveness of Project-Based Learning. <p>3. Methodology section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The author should demonstrate the model used by Borg and Gall (1989) so that the readers have a thorough understanding of it. ii. The author should mention when the preliminary study was conducted and how many people participated in it. iii. The author must write it in paragraph format for the data analysis techniques part. iv. The author must describe how qualitative data was transformed into quantitative data. What tools/techniques were employed? <p>4. Results and discussion section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It is necessary for the author to demonstrate how to obtain the percentage of the expert test. ii. The author must justify why this explanatory text writing worksheet is relevant for testing. iii. The purpose of the wide-scale test must be explained by the author. iv. The title of some tables needs to be more specific. v. The author must explain the significance of the findings and tie them to earlier literature so that the reader has a better grasp. vi. The author must justify why the usage of LKPD is appropriate for educational purposes. vii. The author must justify why the usage of LKPD is very feasible for educational purposes. <p>5. Conclusion section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. In this section, the author must also discuss the significance of the study as well as its practical implications of the study. ii. The difficulties encountered during the development of LKPD have not been specified as a goal of this study. As a result, it must also be listed as one of the study's research objectives. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>6. Reference section</p> <p>i. The author needs to add the latest references (2019 and above) since the latest reference in the manuscript is 2018.</p> <p>7. Others</p> <p>i. This manuscript should be proofread because it has numerous grammatical problems and the structure of the sentence is difficult to comprehend.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mohd Aidil Riduan Awang Kader
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA Pahang, Malaysia