

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94005
Title of the Manuscript:	Reflective Thinking Skills and Attitude towards Problem-Solving as Mediated by Mathematical Resilience of the Students
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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include researches in the introduction to show what gaps the study addresses, you may compare it to other similar studies and underline/highlight any improvements or changes made to stress the originality of the work. • There was an ambiguity on the use of cluster sampling. Stratified sampling was also suggested however, its application in the study was not clarified (As how I understand in the presentation, you randomly identify the school in each division, which researcher considers division as cluster sampling which does not support the definition of the technique). Describe how the sample size was identified and the technique utilized in the selection of each respondents as foundation for the use of path analysis. • the instrument's reliability result mentioned over .90 shows that the instrument have repetitive items of the same construct. As to the content validity value mentioned, pls refer a source for interpreting it as high (You may use Aiken value or the agreement ratio). Instrument may be describe further as to its type and number of items included. • Discuss directly to the result, and its implication (results). Highlight only the most significant result. Highlight also the conclusion can be made if relationship is existing among variable as to the strength and magnitude of the relationship and its implication. In the path analysis, the initial model should be presented and make necessary discussion if changes have been made from initial to the final model. • Change Table 2 as D.I. not D. E. • The content discussed in [368-393] may have provided a table for reference. • Make necessary conclusions among students as a result of the study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency on the use of 3rd person in writing the discussion. • The implication made in (135-136, 175-177) is not necessary. • Pls refer APA format in the inferential result (initial 0 can be eliminated as to the probability value of the significance) 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mary-An U. Magbanua
Department, University & Country	University of Antique, Philippines