ECLÉTICA QUÍMICA

Eclet. Quim. 51 | e-1627, 2026

Peer Review Reports

Case-based learning for fostering scientific literacy: A systematic review

The article went through 2 rounds of review, the reviewer A agreed previously to publish his report, revealing his identity and reviewer B chose not to share his or her opinion; therefore, only his or her final decision will be published anonymously

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: Yusran Khery
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Major Suggestions for Improvement
1. Clarity and Structure
Reorganize long paragraphs: Break down dense paragraphs into manageable parts to improve readability.
Use consistent section formatting: Apply clear headings, subheadings, and transitions across all sections.
Avoid repetition: Many sections restate conclusions or ideas that were already covered—condense to stay concise.
2. Academic Tone and Style
Replace informal phrases with more academic language (e.g., "CBL is a way to teach..." → "CBL is an instructional strategy...").
Use objective and precise wording—especially in conclusions and recommendations.
3. Graph and Table Integration
Every graph mentioned should be explained clearly in the text using specific data.
Avoid stating "the graph above" without context—describe the trend or result shown.
4. Consistency in Terminology
Be consistent when referring to learning models: use CBL, IBL, PBL, and PjBL only after defining them clearly.
Don't switch between full names and abbreviations arbitrarily.
5. Conclusion and Contribution
Strengthen the final conclusion: emphasize the practical value of your findings and give a stronger call to action or implication for educators/policymakers.
Clarify the research contribution more explicitly—how does your synthesis fill a gap or guide future practice?
Reviewer Files

Reviewer B: Anonymous
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer B chose not to share his or her opinion; therefore, only his or her final decision will be published anonymously.

ANSWERS TO ROUND 1

Author's Files

ROUND 2

Reviewer A: Yusran Khery
Recommendation: Accept Submission
The authors have adequately addressed all the concerns raised in the previous review. The revisions are thorough, and the manuscript has significantly improved in clarity and scientific rigor. I am satisfied with the current version and have no further suggestions. I recommend the paper for acceptance.

Reviewer B: Anonymous
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Reviewer B chose not to share his or her opinion; therefore, only his or her final decision will be published anonymously.

ANSWERS TO ROUND 2

Author's Files

ACCEPT SUBMISSION

July. 26, 2026