

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_130415
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Culture-Based Literary Text of Mother Tongue-Based Multi-Lingual Education Curriculum
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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.	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides empirical evidence on the benefits of integrating culture-based literary texts into the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) curriculum. By addressing critical issues such as student disengagement and poor academic performance, the study demonstrates that culturally relevant materials significantly enhance student engagement, academic achievement, and cultural awareness. The findings advocate for a culturally responsive educational framework that not only improves learning outcomes but also preserves and promotes local cultural heritage. This research contributes valuable insights into multilingual and culturally contextualized education, making it a vital resource for educators and policymakers aiming to enhance educational inclusivity and effectiveness.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title accurately reflects the study's focus on evaluating culture-based literary texts within the context of the MTB-MLE curriculum. However, it could be improved for clarity and conciseness while maintaining specificity. Suggest an alternative title; 1. Enhancing Education Through Culture-Based Literary Texts in MTB-MLE Curricula 2. The Impact of Culture-Based Texts on Engagement and Learning in Multilingual Education	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is well-structured and comprehensive, effectively summarizing the purpose, methods, findings, and implications of the study. Additional suggestions; The abstract already states the study's purpose, but it could benefit from a more explicit mention of the specific problem being addressed, such as the lack of culturally relevant instructional materials in the MTB-MLE curriculum. It would be more comprehensive if the author mention that the study responds to disengagement and underperformance caused by culturally distant educational materials. The abstract mentions improvements in engagement and performance but could provide more specific numbers to give readers a quick understanding of the impact. Include key statistics, such as the percentage increase in engagement and the average score improvements, to provide quantifiable insights. The abstract is slightly lengthy and could benefit from tightening to avoid repetition and make it more concise. My suggestion is; remove phrases that reiterate points, such as overly detailed descriptions of the materials developed, to keep the focus on the key takeaways.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, The manuscript is scientifically correct and contributes valuable knowledge to multilingual and culturally responsive education. It effectively uses a structured methodology and presents clear findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a range of references relevant to the topic, but there is room for improvement in terms of recentness, diversity, and alignment with the study's focus. Below is an evaluation and suggestions for enhancement;	

Review Form 3

	<div>1. Several references are over a decade old (e.g., McCarty, T. L., et al. (2005), Gay, 2010; UNESCO, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 1994). While these are seminal works, incorporating more recent studies (from the last 5–7 years) would reflect current trends and advancements in the field.</div> <div>2. The manuscript could benefit from additional references specific to multilingual education and cultural pedagogy in Southeast Asia or other comparable regions. This would provide a broader context and enhance the relevance of findings.</div> <div>3. Incorporating references to recent empirical studies on the effectiveness of culture-based curricula or mother tongue-based education would strengthen the evidence base.</div>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<div>Yes, It has several strengths that make it suitable for scholarly communication. It uses a formal and academic tone, clearly presents its objectives, methods, and findings, and follows a logical structure with smooth transitions. These elements make the content easy to follow and understand.</div> <div>However, there are areas for improvement. Some sentences are too long and could be simplified for clarity. Repeated ideas, such as the importance of cultural awareness, should be streamlined to avoid redundancy. Additionally, terms like "effectiveness" and "impact" are used interchangeably and should be standardized for consistency.</div>	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is scientifically correct and contributes valuable knowledge to multilingual and culturally responsive education. It effectively uses a structured methodology and presents clear findings. It is well-written and largely suitable for scholarly communication, but implementing the suggested refinements will elevate its quality, making it more precise, polished, and impactful for academic audiences.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anwar Rahman
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Negeri Lampung, Indonesia