

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_98315
Title of the Manuscript:	Synchronous, Asynchronous and Modular Distance Learning: Effects on Students' Mathematics Performance
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript informs about a comparison between three instructional strategies. As such, it's interesting for researchers and teachers. Besides, authors constructed some of the instruments used gathering data; the processes of construction and validation of these questionnaires are another interesting issue.</p> <p>2. The title describes what the article is about.</p> <p>3. Abstract begins with the sentence "This study was conducted to determine the significance of..." However, it should say <i>This study was conducted to determine the <u>existence of significant differences between students' performance in Mathematic participating in...</u></i> Besides, it must briefly present some details of the research: how was performance measured, how differences were studied, description of the didactical interventions used, among others.</p> <p>4. Structure is in general appropriate. However, as I shall argue below, some section could be reorganized, and some must be added.</p> <p>5. Methodological design is appropriate, and instruments collecting data also are. However, report doesn't inform about materials used in the three different teaching strategies, nor about the mathematical concepts covered. This is an important issue, because differences detected can't be attributed to a certain strategy if, for example, different instructional materials were used. I shall extend this argument below.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent. However, references quoted in the text sometimes don't appear in the final list, and some of the list aren't quoted in the text.</p> <p>Referring to 4. Authors constructed and validated two sets of questionnaires, one for the pretest and the other for the posttest, and give some details of them, which results insufficient. At least, it must be informed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many questionnaires are there in each set? Are questionnaires of pretest set related to respective ones of the posttest set? In negative case, why they aren't? In affirmative case, are items of respective questionnaires paired in any sense? If they aren't, why not? If they are, which criterion were used to pair them? Which relations exist, if any, between mathematical contents of questionnaires and the ones of the courses? <p>I suggest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adding a subsection in Section 2, presenting answers to these questions, and some of the items of the questionnaires; in particular, those that are mentioned when discussing results in Section 3, should be moved to this new section. Easing lecture of Section 3, presenting results of the analysis of data in tables, and instead of transcribing items, referring them to the new subsection suggested in A. <p>Referring to 5. Authors presents two classes of analysis based on pretest-posttest: one of them is comparing each group with itself, the other is comparing the three groups between them. In the second class, one of the variables in this study is the method of teaching, and authors attributes differences found to this variable. However, this is not the only variable; for example, there are no mention to teaching materials used, which necessarily are diverse, because they must be adapted to the modality of teaching used; neither there are comments about contents covered in each case, which could be diverse or perhaps emphasises different aspects of the same content, taking into account the results of the pretest. I suggest that authors argue about this issue, explaining why it is plausible attributing differences found only to the method of teaching and not to other factors as the examples I have presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Uruguay, Uruguay