

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_91669
Title of the Manuscript:	Contemporary Preservice Mathematics Teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge Levels in Perspective: Self-reported Survey
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.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/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"> 1. In the introduction before the last paragraph, please make a research analysis GAP that distinguishes it from similar or previous research. 2. Please clarify the problem and purpose of the research. 3. In research methodology, Kindly focus more on the Winneba of Ghana region, as it is the population of the study. no need to discuss other regions "Cape Coast in Ghana". 4. Kindly shorten the research methodology section to be concise and clear. Please take only the important points. 5. please improve the conclusions so that the findings in the abstract and conclusions can be consistent. The conclusion does not provide clear results obtained. impressed only in the form of recommendations alone. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you only use a calculator there is no need to say software. software is used if you use software that is specific to a program (In research methodology). 2. It would be nice to add the indicators used in the questionnaire and assessment indicators (range of assessment) 3. please include the DOI or link in the reference (if any). and please use more references of the last 10 years. 	
Optional/General comments	in general the article is good, coherent, and interesting	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indah Suciati
Department, University & Country	Alkhairaat University, Indonesia