

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126905
Title of the Manuscript:	IN APPLICATION OF CURRICULUM MAPPING RELATION TO CLASSROOM LEARNING OUTCOMES OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is essential for the scientific community because it addresses the evolving needs of educational practices, offering valuable insights into the relationship between curriculum mapping and learning outcomes. The study provides a comprehensive framework that can inform curriculum development and teacher training by exploring concepts such as vertical, horizontal, subject-area, and interdisciplinary coherence. I appreciate the manuscript for its practical relevance and potential impact on improving educational strategies, making it a significant contribution to research in the field of education.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title sounds confusing. Revised Title: "The Application of Curriculum Mapping in Relation to Classroom Learning Outcomes in Public Elementary Schools".	
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 provides a clear overview of the study, including the research purpose, methodology, participants, and key findings. However, it could be improved to enhance readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, are logically organized, and accurately reflect the content expected within each section.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The comprehensive methodology, including detailed descriptions of data collection and analysis, ensures the reliability and validity of the findings. Additionally, the study's focus on significant and relevant concepts like curriculum mapping and its impact on classroom learning outcomes add to its scientific value, providing meaningful insights for educational research and practice.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The manuscript's references are insufficient and need improvement. Some existing references are incomplete and lack essential details, affecting the work's credibility and thoroughness. Additionally, Figure 1 cites two references ("Jacobs, 2017" and "DepEd Memo 143, 2012") that are not listed in the bibliography. It is recommended that all references be completed and that cited sources are adequately documented to enhance the manuscript's reliability and comprehensiveness.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A thorough review and correction are necessary to ensure content accuracy and clarity, addressing any grammatical and structural issues. Refining the phrasing will further enhance readability and precision.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript addresses an important topic in educational research and provides valuable insights into curriculum mapping and its impact on learning outcomes. However, improvements in the language quality, completeness of references, and clarity of presentation are necessary to strengthen the manuscript.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gutu Maria
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Moldova, Moldova