

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_105233
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on Mathematics Expression Ability of High School Students in China
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.Mathematics is an 'inescapable' subject either in school or in life. The 21st century demands mathematical skills in real-life settings. So, the theme selected for the present investigation is apt for the scientific community.</p> <p>2.Though the furnished title is appropriate, still it can be improvised. Try this, '<i>Mathematical skills among Chinese Students</i>'.</p> <p>3.Abstract contains 232 words with 4 key words. Objectives of the study , research hypotheses/questions/design, findings, implications are to be incorporated in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion and recommendations were presented, whereas, review of literature summary should have been presented lucidly.</p> <p>5. Everything was presented systematically, even the studies that support the study were also furnished.</p> <p>6.Nearly 31 references were cited. First two references were cited from other 29.Follow a standardized proforma for citation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The Literature from 2008 till date of submission was studied from journals , and a total of 20 results were referenced, read, and analysed, , but a summary of it would have added colour to the presentation,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The test questions, questionnaires, or interview outlines used by the researchers in the survey process were self-made and have different standards. A line on its validity and reliability should have been added. On the whole, it can be recommended for publication.</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:	N. Samuel Babu
Department, University & Country	Holy Mary Institute of Technology & Science, India