

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	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	<div>1. This manuscript highlights the effectiveness of phenomenon-based learning and digital tools like E-Student Worksheets in improving student engagement and comprehension in chemistry.</div> <div>2. It addresses the growing need for digital literacy and independent learning in education.</div> <div>3. Furthermore, it offers a validated model for curriculum enhancement, providing valuable guidance for modernizing teaching practices</div>	I appreciate your acknowledgment of the manuscript’s focus on the increasing importance of digital literacy and independent learning in education. As we move toward a more digitalized educational environment, these elements are becoming essential for student success, and I hope this manuscript contributes to the ongoing discussions in this area.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<div>The title aligns well in terms of the subject matter and purpose of the research. However, it can be slightly refined to improve clarity, eliminate redundancy, and ensure consistency.</div> <div>1. The phrase "Development of a E-Student Worksheet" is slightly awkward due to the indefinite article "a." Changing it to "an" or rephrasing it improves grammatical flow.</div> <div>2. The title is lengthy and could be more concise without losing key details.</div> <div>Therefore, the following title is suggested: “Developing an E-Student Worksheet Using Phenomenon-Based Learning (PhenoBL) for Reaction Rate Material on Wizer.me for Class XI High School/MA”</div>	I corrected the title to address grammatical and length issues to ensure the title is more concise and consistent with the content of the research as you suggested.

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, but may be improved based on the following guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The abstract begins with the aim of the paper. It could have briefly mentioned why this approach is significant or the gap it addresses.</li><li>2. In explain the method; the explanation is sufficient but slightly verbose. Consider simplifying by omitting "but this research was only carried out only up to the development stage" unless it's critical to the study's limitations.</li><li>3. It provides detailed validation results; but it could be improved by summarizing percentage breakdowns more succinctly to avoid overwhelming the reader.</li><li>4. The conclusion could connect the findings more explicitly to the potential impact on educational practices or outcomes</li></ol>	<p>Thank you for your detailed and constructive feedback. I appreciate your insights on how the abstract can be improved to better communicate the significance, methodology, and results.</p> <p>1. I have added the significancy of using the learning model in the reaction rate material in the abstract.</p> <p>2. Thank you for pointing out that the explanation of the method could be more concise. "Was only carried out only up to the development stage" has been changed to "was limited to the development stage." Adapt to suggestions from other reviewers.</p> <p>3. Thank you for your feedback. While I understand the concern about the level of detail, I believe that providing the percentage breakdowns in this section is essential for offering a clear and thorough understanding of the validation results. The detailed percentages help to highlight the specific contributions of each factor and ensure transparency in the findings.</p> <p>4. I have added the impact of the conclusion.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes, because it adheres to established principles of research methodology, includes proper references, and presents logical arguments. However, it could strengthen its argument by explicitly stating <i>why</i> the chosen approach (PhenoBL and Wizer.me) is superior to other digital or pedagogical methods.</p>	<p>Thank you for your thoughtful feedback. I appreciate your recognition of the manuscript's adherence to established research principles and its logical presentation.</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The refernces are sufficient and recent, but to make it more relevant the author could add recent papers in 2024 such as: "Ualikhanova, B., Ormanova, G., Berdaliyev, D., Mussakhan, N., Anas, B., &amp; Güdekli, E. (2024). Impact of Phenomenon-Based Learning on High School Physics Education in Shymkent, Kazakhstan. <i>Qubahan Academic Journal</i>, 4(4), 225-236."</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable suggestion. While I appreciate the relevance of the 2024 paper you mentioned, I believe the current references included in the manuscript are well-aligned with the focus and scope of the article. The selected sources provide a comprehensive foundation for the theoretical framework and methodologies discussed. I have ensured that the references are closely tied to the core topics of Phenomenon-Based Learning and its application in educational contexts, which are central to the study. However, I will review the suggested paper to assess its potential contribution to the manuscript, while maintaining the integrity of the current reference list.</p>
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication in this paper</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive feedback regarding the language quality of the paper. I'm glad to hear that it meets the standards for scholarly communication. I will continue to ensure clarity and precision throughout the manuscript, and I appreciate your recognition of the language used.</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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>	