

# Review of: "The teaching of Apostle Peter and Relevance to The Christian Religious Education in Bantul Regency and Gunung Kidul Regency Yogyakarta"

Pratiwi Tri Utami<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hiroshima University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors

I appreciate your idea for this article.

After reading and reviewing your article, there are some issues that I need to point out. First, it is hard for me to understand the whole idea of the article because of the lack of a straightforward story from the abstract to the conclusion.

Second, the structure is also unclear which adds to the confusion in this article. In the abstract, the authors do not mention the objectives, methodology, and results of the research. In the introduction, the authors mainly explain God's chosen in the whole introduction, even the first paragraph of the introduction section is started with "This election", I am wondering which election you mean in this sentence. Besides, the introduction is lack an explanation about Christian Religious Education Teachers, what is to be clarified in this article, the objectives, the problem statement, or the research question. Moreover, in the literature review, the authors explain the Apostle Peter's teaching but do not mention the relationship between Christian Religious Education Teachers and Apostle Peter's teaching. The Research methodology is also not clear to me. No information about who is the research participants, the number of participants in the survey, and how is the survey is being analysed. Even, the authors did not explain the population information (Bantul Regency and Gunung Kidul Regency), or why these areas are chosen in this research. Then, I have confused about the section 'Results and Discussion' and 'Research Results', I think they refer to the same terminology, and which one? and in Results and Discussion, I am not sure the explanation can satisfy or represent the Results and Discussion. What I read was just only the Apostle's teaching, it somehow looks like more literature reviews to me. In the Research result, the endogenous variables are not being clarified well. In the Hypothesis test section, there is a lack of information about the presented table, no title and no detailed information. Also, the research result in the table is the measurement that is used to identify the category level. Then, in the conclusion section, I do not understand how the conclusions are formed because there is no correlation between each section in the article. Lastly, in References, there are a lot of mistakes in the citation, such as there is no synchronised between references and citations. For example, I do not find any citations for Arnold, (2002), and Campbell (2015), but they are written in the references or other examples, there is a year difference for Purwasasi, et all, in the citation, it is written 2021, but in the references, it is written 2022. I can not mention them one by one, but you need to be careful about this.

In this article, I can not see the link between each section from the abstract until the conclusion.