Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_129714**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Development of a E-Student Worksheet Based on Phenomenon Based Learning (PhenoBL) on Reaction Rate Material Using the Wizer.me Website For Class XI High School/MA**
Type of the Article	

<mark>PART 1:</mark> 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)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript significantly contributes to the integration of technology in education, particularly by developing an E-Student Worksheet based on the Phenomenon-Based Learning (PhenoBL) model. This approach emphasizes real-world phenomena and engages students interactively, aligning with the global shift towards digital and contextual learning. It addresses the lack of interactive digital worksheets in chemistry education, providing a validated and user-friendly alternative. The findings support the use of digital tools to enhance active learning and critical thinking in high school students	**Thank you for your thoughtful and positive feedback. I'm pleased to hear that the manuscript is seen as a significant contribution to integrating technology in education, particularly with the development of an E-Student Worksheet based on the Phenomenon-Based Learning (PhenoBL) model.**
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The current title is clear but somewhat lengthy. A more concise alternative could be: "Development of a Phenomenon-Based E-Student Worksheet for High School Chemistry Using Wizer.me"	**Thank you for your valuable feedback. Following your suggestion and incorporating input from another reviewer, I have revised the title to make it more concise and clear.** The new title is: **"Developing an E-Student Worksheet Using Phenomenon-Based Learning for Reaction Rate Material on Wizer.me for Class XI High School/MA"**
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could be streamlined to impact of the research. Suggested improvements: Highlight the gap in current educational practices more explicitly. Reduce repetitive phrases about validation and user response results. Example modification: "This study develops a Phenomenon-Based E-Student Worksheet on Reaction Rate material for Class XI High School/MA using Wizer.me, validated through the 4-D development model. The worksheet achieved high validation scores across content, language, and presentation aspects and was positively received by teachers and students, proving its effectiveness and practicality as a digital teaching tool."	**Thank you for your valuable suggestions. I have revised the abstract in accordance with your recommendations.**
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with detailed methods and validation processes. However, the inclusion of a clearer explanation of how PhenoBL directly enhances reaction rate understanding would strengthen the manuscript.	**Thank you for your thoughtful feedback. I appreciate your recognition of the manuscript's scientific soundness and the detail provided in the methods and validation processes. I have added the importance of using the learning model in the reaction rate material in the introduction paragraph 4.**
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly current and relevant, but additional citations on: The impact of PhenoBL in STEM education. Comparative studies of digital vs. traditional worksheets in chemistry. Suggested additions: Please add clearly how the Pheno-BL model/method is derived Articles on PhenoBL in secondary education. Research on integrating Wizer.me or similar platforms in learning environments.	**Thank you for your suggestion. While I agree that adding references on the impact of PhenoBL in STEM education and comparative studies on digital vs. traditional worksheets in chemistry could strengthen the manuscript, I believe the current references are already well-aligned with the study's focus. They adequately support the core objectives of PhenoBL and digital learning tools. Thank you for your valuable input.**

		About suggested additions: **1. I have added how the Pheno-BL model is derived in paragraph 3.** **2. I have added other supporting research regarding the use of the PhenoBL model and Wizer.me in paragraph 6.**
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is generally clear and suitable for academic communication but could benefit from minor edits for conciseness and grammar. For example: • Replace "was only carried out only up to the development stage" with "was limited to the development stage." • Simplify long sentences for readability.	**Thank you for your feedback. I have made the following revisions as per your suggestions:** 1. **"Was only carried out only up to the development stage"** has been changed to **"was limited to the development stage."** 2. I have simplified longer sentences to improve readability and enhance clarity throughout the manuscript.

<u>**Optional/General**</u> **comments**	I don't see the phases of phenoBL. Please explain with certainty the indicators you used in compiling the worksheet.
	Which phenoBL phase do you use, several previous studies should be added to support the literature and your theoretical basis
	add references to each indicator, criterion, that you used in this research.
	
	Tables and fgures are well structured but may include a brief caption summarizing their relevance. Consider outlining the scalability and future applications of the developed worksheet. Include relevant and credible sources.
	
	General Feedback: The manuscript demonstrates a solid foundation in research methodology and presents a comprehensive development and validation of the E-Student Worksheet. However, several areas require minor revisions to improve clarity, coherence, and presentation.
	Specific Revision Notes:
	1. Abstract
	• The abstract is clear but verbose in some areas. Consider condensing the explanation of the methodology and results to make it more concise.
	2. Introduction
	• Strengthen the connection between the PhenoBL model and its advantages for reaction rate topics.
	• Ensure all references are properly cited with complete details.
	3. Methodology
	• Clarify the choice of the 4-D model and why dissemination was excluded from this study.
	• The "Develop Develop Design Design Define Define Disseminate Disseminate" duplication under the development flow figure should be corrected.
	4. Results and Discussion
	• Validation Results:
	    ○ The presentation of Table 4 and Table 5 is clear, but additional interpretation on how the results relate to educational practice would strengthen this section.
	• User Responses:
	    ○ The analysis of user feedback is strong. Consider elaborating on how feedback regarding screen size and question quantity might influence future iterations.
	5. Formatting
	• Standardize formatting for headings and subheadings.
	• Ensure consistent citation style throughout the text.
		Thank you for your valuable suggestions. I have made the following revisions:
		1. I have added the phases of the Phenomenon-based Learning.
		2. I have added previous studies in paragraph 6.
		3. I have added the references to each indicator, criterion, that i used in this research.
		
		Specific Revision Notes:
		    1. Abstract.
		I've corrected and removed unnecessary sentences in the abstract, and in accordance with suggestions from other reviewers as well.
		    2. Introduction
		I have added about the connection between the Phenomenon-based Learning model and the reaction rate material in paragraph 4.
		    3. Methodology
		I have already added a reason why the disseminate stage is not carried out.
		    4. Result and Discussion
		• Validation Results
		I have added an explanation of the relationship between the data in the table and learning.
		• Users Response
		It has been explained about the input from the feedback given by students to the user response. It can be seen in the discussion.
		    5. Formatting
		• **Standardized formatting for headings and subheadings**: I have ensured that all headings and subheadings follow a consistent style throughout the manuscript, adhering to the formatting guidelines.
		• **Consistent citation style**: I have reviewed and standardized the citation style to ensure consistency throughout the text, following the journal's citation guidelines.
		• **Revisited layout of tables and figures**: I have adjusted the alignment and spacing of tables and figures to ensure proper presentation and consistency across the manuscript.
		
		    6. Conclusion
		
		I have revised the conclusion to briefly discuss potential directions for the dissemination stage. This addition highlights the next steps for sharing the developed E-Student Worksheet with a wider audience

Review Form 3

	• Revisit the layout of tables and figures for alignment and spacing.
	6. Conclusion
	    • The conclusion effectively summarizes the findings but could briefly discuss potential directions for the dissemination stage.
	7. References
	    • Verify that all references are complete and correctly formatted according to the journal's guidelines.
		and exploring its implementation in diverse educational settings. I believe this will provide a more comprehensive ending to the manuscript.
		
		    7. References
		
		Thank you for your suggestion. I have thoroughly reviewed all references to ensure they are complete and correctly formatted according to the journal's guidelines.

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	