

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.	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	
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"	
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."	
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.	
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.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English is generally clear and suitable for academic communication but could benefit from minor edits for conciseness and grammar. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace "was only carried out only up to the development stage" with "was limited to the development stage." • Simplify long sentences for readability. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The analysis of user feedback is strong. Consider elaborating on how feedback regarding screen size and question quantity might influence future iterations. 5. Formatting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardize formatting for headings and subheadings. • Ensure consistent citation style throughout the text. • Revisit the layout of tables and figures for alignment and spacing. 6. Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion effectively summarizes the findings but could briefly discuss potential directions for the dissemination stage. 7. References <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify that all references are complete and correctly formatted according to the journal's guidelines. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Waode Yunia Silviariza
Department, University & Country	Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia