

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_87181
Title of the Manuscript:	Teacher Noticing: A Case Study of Students Cognition of a Course Content
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This is a good study, mainly the topic is relevant. However, the author(s) need to take note of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript needs revision for language and grammar errors.</li> <li>2. The problem statement requires a major revision. First, the statement should briefly let the readers know the ideal situation of classroom teaching &amp; learning in mathematics education. Second, state the gap(s) in this area that calls for the present study. Third, citations from previous studies indicate the gap(s) and what the current research will do to fill the gap(s).</li> <li>3. The methodology did not explain the procedure for the research. The procedure for research must be straightforward for the reproducibility principle. The author(s) should explain how the data for the study is obtained in simple steps. For example, in a quasi-experiment, there will be two groups (experimental and control). A test or questionnaire will be administered to each group depending on the treatment. I use this to explain a simple procedure. The role played by the researcher(s) should be stated in the procedure section and at what time.</li> <li>4. The discussion is not rigorous. The author(s) cited only one previous research in this section. Results must be compared with previous studies to validate the research outcome.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Aina, Jacob Kola
Department, University & Country	Kwara State College of Education, Nigeria