Review Form 1.6

Coference Name:	6th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2020)
Manuscript Number:	**LearnNoorhapizah20201**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Learning Material Development Containing Critical Thinking and Creative Thinking Skills Based on Local Wisdom**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	✓ **You have to pay more attention to how to cite reference. Error is found, as in:** (1) Riris Tiani, "Balinese and Sumbawa Language Correspondence," pp. 118–127. - (year?). ✓ **Please, write the meaning of each word in the table, instead of its gloss.** ✓ **Please, give further explanation about each local language mentioned in that journal article and their relation to other languages classified as Austronesian languages.**	
Minor REVISION comments	✓ **Grammar errors, as in:** (1) The study ***investigate*** the phonemic correspondence in Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik located in Sibolga coast, north sumatera., **it should be** "The study ***investigates*** the phonemic correspondence in Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik located in Sibolga Coast, North Sumatera." - (***investigates* as the subject is singular noun**); (2) Four respondents aparticipated in this study with age more than 70 years old, live in sibolga, and ***able*** to speak Indonesian., **it should be** "Four respondents participated in this study with age more than 70 years old, live in Sibolga and is able to speak Indonesian." - (**verb *is* should be added to complete the phrase**); (3) … ***thus*** Kui has a high level of correspondence to Hamap language than Kamang language [6][6]., **it should be the next sentence, as** "***Thus,*** Kui has a high level of correspondence to Hamap language than Kamang language [6][6]."; ✓ **Vocabulary errors, as in:** (1) Phonemic correspondence ***from*** every language is different., **it should be** "Phonemic correspondence ***of*** every language is different."; (2) It was the reason to analyse the ***phonemeic*** correspondence in Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik., **it should be** "It was the reason to analyse the ***phonemic*** correspondence in Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik."; (3) The techniques of data collection were observation and ***questioner***., **it should be** "The techniques of data collection were observation and ***questionnaire***."; ***(4)*** There were four respondents with the criteria: sex: male/female, ***age:*** more than 70 years old, healthy ***inside and outside***, ***live*** in Sibolga ***coast***, ***able*** to speak Indonesian [7]., **it should be** "There were four respondents with the criteria sex: male/female, ***aged*** more than 70 years old, healthy ***both physically and mentally***, ***living*** in Sibolga ***Coast***,	

	being able to speak Indonesian [7]."; (5) It was found that there were sound ***correspondence*** between Barus Pasar language and Barus Kampung Mudik language ***namely***: ***Phonemic*** correspondences in a~o, u~o, i~e, i~a, i~o, b~ ø, and ø~h., **it should be** "It was found that there were sound ***correspondences*** between Barus Pasar language and Barus Kampung Mudik language***, namely phonemic*** correspondences in a~o, u~o, i~e, i~a, i~o, b~ ø, and ø~h."; (6) ***Them*** appearance of a~o ***were*** around 26 times., **it should be** "***The*** appearance of correspondence a~o ***was*** around 26 times."; (7) It showed that ***the 26 words*** in Barus pasar language had correspondence with Barus kampung mudik language., **it should be** "It showed that ***26 words*** in Barus pasar language had correspondence with Barus kampung mudik language."; (8) The couple of ***Phonemics*** u~o in the data ***were shown*** 11 times …, **it should be** "The couple of ***phonemic*** u~o in the data ***emerged*** 11 times …"; (9) The Phonemic ***Coresspodence*** /i~e/ was found 4 times…, **it should be** "The Phonemic ***Correspondence*** /i~e/ was found 4 times…"; **(10)** Phonemic ***Coresspodence*** /i~a/ appeared in the data twice,…, **it should be** "Phonemic ***Correspondence*** /i~a/ appeared in the data twice,…"; **(11)** Phonemic ***Coresspodence*** /b~ ø/ was found once in the data…, **it should be** "Phonemic ***Correspondence*** /b~ ø/ was found once in the data…"; (12) The Phonemic ***Coresspodence*** /ø~h/ appeared 4 times…, **it should be** "The Phonemic ***Correspondence*** /ø~h/ appeared 4 times…"; (13) … it was found that between Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik has phonemic correspondence ***in vocal and consonant***., **it should be** "… it was found that between Barus Pasar and Barus Kampung Mudik has phonemic correspondence, ***both vocal and consonant***."; ***(14)*** Vocal 'a,u and i' in Barus Pasar ***was reflected to*** vocal 'o' in Barus kampung mudik, while vocal 'I' in Barus Pasar ***was reflected to*** vocal "e and a" in Barus Kampung mudik. The ***reflection of consonant b in Barus pasar was to 'ø' in Barus Kampung Mudik and 'ø' in Barus Pasar to 'h" in Barus Kampung mudik***., **it should be** "Vocal 'a,u and i' in Barus Pasar ***corresponded to*** vocal 'o' in Barus Kampung Mudik, while vocal 'I' in Barus Pasar ***had phonemic connection to*** vocal "e and a" in Barus Kampung Mudik. The ***relation of consonant b in Barus pasar and 'ø' in Barus Kampung Mudik was found, however, phoneme 'ø' in Barus Pasar linked with 'h" in Barus Kampung Mudik***.".	
Optional/General comments	It is **strongly** recommended to improve your English, especially in Sciences and Linguistics term.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ana Purwitasari**
Department, University & Country	**University of Freiburg, Indonesia**

Review Form 1.6

Review Form 1.6

Coference Name:	6th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2020)
Manuscript Number:	**LearnNoorhapizah20201**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Learning Material Development Containing Critical Thinking and Creative Thinking Skills Based on Local Wisdom**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The Conclusion is rather short: a brief expansion would be welcome, especially with a view to emphasizing the main steps of the demonstration.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Catalin Ghita**
Department, University & Country	**University of Craiova, Romania**

Review Form 1.6

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Editor's Comment:

Accepted.

Editor's Details:

ICET 2020 Committee
UM 2020