

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_92861
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Junior High School Students' Achievement in Algebraic Expressions: The Pre-test-Post-test Non-equivalent Control Group Design
Type of the 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The title of the article indicates classroom action research because there is the word "improve". Classroom action research uses cycles. While the content of this paper shows experimental research (paired and independent samples). Therefore, the title can be changed to: The effect of think-pair-share learning on algebra learning achievement of junior high school students: pre-test-post-test non-equivalent control group design. In this article, the learning method is written. There is no learning method. There is a learning model. Cooperative learning is a learning model and not a learning method. In this paper, it is not known the type of learning carried out in the control class. If conventional learning needs to be mentioned which one. Think-pair-share learning is a type of cooperative learning and not collaborative learning. In this study, it is not stated whether the pretest questions are the same as the posttest questions or are different. In this study, there was no normality test on the pre test. In paired samples, it is better to use the 1-tailed test so that you can find out which one is better. If you use a 2-tailed test, the results are only to find out whether there is a difference. In conclusion, the results of the study do not show that there is an effect of think-pair-share learning on student achievement. In the conclusion section, one of the research results has not been mentioned, namely The effect of think-pair-share learning on algebra learning achievement of junior high school students. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This paper still mentions lecturers and students while the research is carried out in schools. Should use teachers and students. As per the new paradigm in education, the term 'teaching' has been replaced with 'learning' Writing collaborative learning in this paper is replaced with cooperative learning. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In general, this article is interesting The methodology is good Acceptable with slight revision. 	

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:	Agapitus Hendrikus Kaluge
Department, University & Country	Widya Mandira Catholic University, Indonesia