

Improving student chemistry laboratory performance through Nyamplung ethnoscience-oriented learning of the *Sasak* tribe

The article underwent 4 rounds of review. The authors agreed to disclose the reviewers' reports and their responses to the reviewers' comments.

Disclaimer: The peer review report content is the entire copy of the reviewers' and authors' comments. Typing and punctuation errors are not edited.

ROUND 1

Reviewer A: Citra Ayu Dewi

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Recommendation: Revision

[Reviewer Files](#)

Reviewer B: Anonymous

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Please find the comments I provided in the attached file.

[Reviewer Files](#)

Reviewer C: Ratna Dewi

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Research with the title Improving student chemistry laboratory performance does not match the research results obtained
2. The abstract written the purpose of the research is still not precise, the research method used has not been written clearly, there is no sampling, there is no data collection technique, there is no data analysis method. the research results in the abstract do not increase.
3. Have not written highlights and highlighted in the article
4. please delete inappropriate highlights
5. there are no images before the introduction.
6. add other relevant international journal sources
7. there is an explanation before displaying the image
8. add research questions in the introduction
9. the method section does not explain what research method is used as a basis for conducting the research.
10. the Scheme of pretest-posttest non control group design table does not explain who the method refers to
11. the sampling method in this study has not been explained. how were 17 students obtained?
12. this study has 3 practical activities with 3 different projects, but it has not been explained how the steps are in working on this project
13. assessment is taken from observation and portfolio. but it is not explained who the observer is and how the interrater assessment is?
14. the table displayed is too long, it is better to categorize or group it
15. the table Students' performance category and the n-gain table refer to whose theory?

Peer Review Reports

16. in the results and discussion section it is better to separate and provide an initial explanation of the general description of the research results before entering the results sub-chapter
 17. The results of the values displayed in the image are not explained as the results of observations or portfolio values.
 18. the discussion does not explain the purpose of the practicum, the chemicals used, and the steps of the activities carried out in detail
 19. the source of the image has not been written
 20. The context of the nyamplung ethnoscience obtained from indigenous science and then reconstructed into scientific knowledge is not conveyed
 21. explain in detail the practical activities 1, 2 and 3 carried out with ethnoscience. What projects were conducted and what results were obtained
 22. can add Novelty and relevance of the work
- Author contributions, Funding, Acknowledgement, Ethical statement, Declaration of Interest, and Data Availability Statement under the conclusion
23. N-gain in the results of this study is low, indicating that there is no potential to improve student laboratories
 24. how can you get 3 N-Gain scores when the method is only 1x pretest and 1x posttest.
 25. the test used during the study has not been submitted and what are the results?
 26. too many national journals, add international journals

[Reviewer Files](#)**Reviewer D: Anonymous****Recommendation:** Revisions Required

Please find my feedbacks within document

[Reviewer Files](#)

AUTHORS' ANSWERS – ROUND 1

In this first round, the authors did not provide the reviewers with a response letter, only the corrected manuscript.

ROUND 2

Reviewer D was invited to review the paper but was unable to complete the review and therefore did not participate in the subsequent rounds.

Reviewer A: Citra Ayu Dewi

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Add references that support ethnoscience studies. The following are references that support your research in ethnoscience studies:

1. Dewi, C. A., Khery, Y., & Erna, M. (2019). An ethnoscience study in chemistry learning to develop scientific literacy. Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia, 8(2), 279-287.
2. Dewi, C. C. A., Erna, M., Haris, I., & Kundera, I. N. (2021). The effect of contextual collaborative learning based ethnoscience to increase student's scientific literacy ability. Journal of Turkish Science Education, 18(3), 525-541.

[Reviewer Files](#)

Reviewer B: Anonymous

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Please find my feedbacks in the attached file.

[Reviewer Files](#)

Reviewer C: Ratna Dewi

Recommendation: Revisions Required

the article has been improved from the previous one.
there are only a few additional suggestions that support this article.
citations at the beginning of the sentence are not given brackets.
the size of the images and tables must be consistent and the same.
the use of the symbols (,) and (.) in the results figures must be consistent.
improve the conclusions, recommendations, and limitations.
funding does not need to be in the article but in the cover letter.

[Reviewer Files](#)

AUTHORS' ANSWERS – ROUND 2

In this second round, the authors did not provide the reviewers with a response letter, only the corrected manuscript.

ROUND 3

Since reviewer A accepted the article in the second round, he was not invited to give his review in the third round, and we proceeded only with the other reviewers.

Reviewer B: Anonymous

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Please carefully read the feedback given during the previous and current review rounds. I don't think you have made any significant changes. Minor errors are still found here and there. At least improve the readability to make a proper manuscript.

[Reviewer Files](#)

Reviewer C: Ratna Dewi

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The feedbacks can be found in the document.

[Reviewer Files](#)

AUTHORS' ANSWERS – ROUND 3

[Reviewer Files](#)

ROUND 4

Since reviewer B accepted the article in the second round, he was not invited to give his review in the fourth round, and we proceeded only with the other reviewers.

Reviewer C: Ratna Dewi

Recommendation: Revisions Required

There are still some things that need to be fixed highlight, graphical abstract, source of figure, etc

[Reviewer Files](#)

AUTHORS' ANSWERS – ROUND 4

[Reviewer Files](#)

After the submission of the revised version from the 4th round and the corresponding response letter, the Section Editors, Prof. Habiddin Habiddin and Prof. Natany Dayani de Souza Assai, reviewed the materials together with the Editor-in-Chief, Prof. Assis Vicente Benedetti. They concluded that all recommendations had been properly addressed and decided to accept the article for publication.

ARTICLE ACCEPTED