

Review of: "Development of Education for Sustainable Development Integrated Coastal Conservation Education Kit in Junior High Schools"

Ghazali Adiana¹

¹ Universiti Malaysia Terengganu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper has very good material but is not properly addressed. The authors only collect data from one respondent (a teacher) as their expert opinion data, which is totally invalid for research. More respondents need to be included. Extreme major revision is needed prior to publication.

The authors need to properly choose the terminology, since some of the sentences are confusing. For example, in the first sentence of the abstract, the usage of "abrasion" is not a proper term to use, and the sentence is so confusing that I need to go through the details in the paper. The proper terminology that should be used is erosion, since it refers to the loss of sediment and rocks along the coastline.

Another example is the last sentence of the second paragraph of the introduction. "If left unchecked" – authors should properly clarify what "unchecked" means. In the same paragraph, the fourth sentence, authors should give some examples of the human factors.

Numerous language mistakes were made. Revise thoroughly.

Incorrect format of citation. For example, in the third paragraph of the introduction, fourth sentence: Fuad et al. (2021) – the comma after "al." should be deleted. Authors need to thoroughly revise the format throughout the paper.

The current references should be cited. Citations older than 2019 are not recommended.

The abstract should concisely describe the whole story of the research. A thorough revision of all parts of the paper should be done prior to publication, since some of the sentences are not understandable.

Abstract: The authors need to clarify the criteria for an "expert lecturer," since the information is missing from the methodology. The same goes for "expert validation." There is not enough evidence to support that claim.

Introduction: Authors should clarify the specific area; for example, where Tampora Beach is located.

Introduction, paragraph 5: The first sentence is not connected to the rest of the paragraph. This paragraph contains information on expected outcomes, which is more suitable to be placed in the last paragraph of the introduction.

Introduction, paragraph 6: The 4th sentence – incorrect citation format. The 7th sentence – Describe in detail which

features need to be revised and why.

Introduction, paragraph 7: The 3rd sentence doesn't connect to the next sentence. The sentences need to be restructured and rephrased.

Research Method, paragraph 1: Replace Borg and Gall (1983) with a more recent reference, preferably within 5 years of 2023.

Research Method, paragraph 2: Who are the experts? What are their characteristics? What are the characteristics of teachers and students? Detail describes the characteristics.

Research Method: The ADDIE model should be detail described. Why did the authors choose this model?

Research Method, Table 1: What are field notes? Where did the authors collect the scientific articles? What are the keywords being used to collect the scientific articles?

Research Method: How do the authors define qualitative data? Is there any scale/standard used? Describe details of the qualitative data.

Research Method - Table 2, percentage formula & Table 3: The citation format is incorrect.

Research Method, last paragraph: 1 respondent is totally invalid to be used. The authors need to add more respondents, particularly teachers.

The results, discussion, and conclusion sections are not suitable for review since only 1 respondent (a teacher) was used to analyze the kit.