

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-52328**

Date: **16/06/2025**

**Title: Analysis of the Ability to Develop Merdeka Curriculum Teaching Modules Among PPGGT Teachers in PGSD at Unika Santo Paulus Ruteng, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia**

### Recommendation:

✓ Accept as it is .....  
 Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr Anam Zehra

Date: **17/06/2025**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The study offers a clear, practical look at trainee teachers' lesson-plan skills under the new Merdeka curriculum. By using real lesson documents and a straightforward checklist, it gives trainers a quick way to gauge and improve their programmes. The writing is easy to follow, the results are encouraging, and the take-away points are actionable. **I recommend the manuscript be accepted as it is.**

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### Real Evidence:

The authors reviewed lesson plans the trainees actually wrote. This gives readers a clear picture of what new teachers can, do not just what they say they can do.

**Balanced Methods:** Combines numbers with qualitative comments to paint a fuller picture of teacher ability.

### Easy-to-Follow Checklist:

The study judged each plan with a short list of points title page, goals, learning steps, worksheets, and a glossary. Anyone reading the paper can copy this list for their own use.

### Clear Result:

Out of 20 lesson plans, 18 scored in the "good to very good" range. That is encouraging for the training program and shows most trainees understand the Merdeka approach.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Practical Advice

The paper does not stop at numbers. It highlights one missing part (the glossary) so trainers know exactly where to focus future coaching.

### Weaknesses

#### Simple Writing

The authors use everyday language, so lecturers, school teachers, and even policymakers can grasp the findings quickly

**Qualitative Detail:** The paper mentions qualitative data but does not explain how teacher feedback or observations were collected.

**Glossary Oversight:** Although highlighted in the conclusion, there's limited discussion on why the glossary is missing and how to address it.

**Sample Scope:** Evaluates only 20 modules from one institution, so broader generalizations should be made cautiously.

**Contextual Factors:** Does not explore how local constraints (e.g., time, resources) might affect module quality.

**Follow-Up Actions:** Could suggest specific follow-up workshops or mentorship steps based on the findings.