

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_98173
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of 5E instructional model on students' performance in Mathematics non-routine problem
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.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The given study is valuable in demonstrating the effects of using 5E in mathematics teaching. 2. The word 'impact' is ambiguous to me, as the experimental set-up can at best establish effectiveness of the approach, while impact appeals to a long-term effect, rather than only one experiment. Suggested title: <i>Effectiveness</i> of 5E instructional model on students' performance in Mathematics non-routine problem. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. However, there is ambiguity in the sampling method used. (See comments in the manuscript). 4. The articulation of the research questions is missing. Traditionally, research articles have specified objectives articulated before the methods are described. In the results, the way the hypotheses are written became confusing. I suggest improving the structure by means of subheadings/sections rather than re-writing the hypothesis. 5. Yes. However, an expert review on the interpretation of the normality tests may warrant a further review. 6. Yes. I think it is sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Some areas need to be checked such as the use of punctuations. Please see manuscript for further comments.	
Optional/General comments	The 5E model is sufficiently described. However, it may also be helpful if the "conventional" or "traditional" method of teaching is characterized so that the general reader can have a more or less accurate representation of what that traditional instruction constitute.	

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:	Joneil Medina
Department, University & Country	Mindanao State University, Iligan Institute of Technology, Philippines