

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_102234
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATING PRE-SERVICE MATHEMATICS TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ON COGNITIVE NEEDS
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>)

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>Yes, the Article is of direct scientific importance as it falls in the realm of mathematics Education and is tailored in tandem with scientific principles of research.</p> <p>The title is fairly suitable but I feel there could be need for paraphrasing it to be more specific and show that the cognitive needs are in relation to their own learning of mathematics.</p> <p>The abstract has brought out the salient concepts of the write-up.</p> <p>The Structure is good and has outlined the necessary sub-sections, although separate paragraphs/sub-headings could have been helpful on methodology.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>They are sufficient and fairly recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The lens was carefully selected and it is rare, I recommend the article for publication with minor suggestions provided therein.</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:	Kashoka Borniface
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia