

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101877
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Mathematics Problem Solving Ability Students Based on Mathematical Resilience and Gender
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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is interesting, however it has many points that need to be clarified. The delivery of the method is less sufficient and should be improved. The reporting of discussion for the findings should also be improved. The title should be structurally improved. The title at its current form is misleading. The abstract should be improved once the whole article is improved. Mostly on the confusing statement and English proficiency. The keywords should also be selected better. Example, the word 'analysis' is not suitable as the keywords, it is very vague and does not reflect the article. Same comment for most of the keywords used. The subsections are appropriate. However, the structure should be made clear by using numberings or something similar. Make distinguish between the sections. The subsections are very confusing in particular under the section "Results and Discussion" The article is correct, however, the way the article is written has too many gaps that need to be rewritten to give better understanding of the study. Reference is limiting and should include recent references. <p>Additional comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explain more detail on the subjects used. The demography, hetero or homogeneity of the subjects, why they are selected? Share and explain the adopted instruments since it is heavily used in the article. Can include visual presentation of your method to help readers understand your train of thought. The table & figures are very small and cannot be read. This is important since readers are asked to see the figures to make sense of the findings. Explain more on the 'Think a loud' concept and why it is adopted as one of the method. In Table 2, justify why you select these category since the category seems not evenly distributed. Example, if subject get the score of 72 and 20, both will be in Low category; but for subject with score 74 (which is very near to 72 and so far from 20), they will be in category moderate. Doesn't seems fair. For results and discussion, the subject should be identified with only one-type identifier to avoid confusion. Example, if you are using RMPT, only use this for the rest of the article, no need to write "S1" anymore. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The overall writing in English should be improved. Recommended to use proofread before submission.</p> <p>There are a lot of statements that are difficult to understand. Please use proofread.</p> <p>The in-text references do not follow the normal standard of academic writing. Example, can use APA formatting.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Masnita Misiran
Department, University & Country	Centre for Testing, Measurement & Appraisal, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia