

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102446
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Cognitive Degree of Pre-service Junior High School Mathematics Teachers for Geometric Intuition Literacy
Type of the 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Mention the country in the abstract. Discuss the methodology in the abstract.</p> <p>Section 4.1 states research methods, but you start with participants. You need to explain the methodology/methods.</p> <p>Under participants list sampling method. You appear to use convenience sampling, which is a limitation.</p> <p>Your instrumentation is semi-structured.</p> <p>Under data collection, how long were interviews? Were they transcribed? How were interviews conducted? Face to face or video conference? Were there standardized probes? Any follow-up interviews?</p> <p>Your research questions do not align with what you did. First, hypotheses are not common in qualitative work. Secondly, you asked how students "perceived" material, yet you then report findings which test knowledge. There is a disconnect; it would have been far better to use a quantitative methodology to test students' knowledge; you did not want to know perceptions but knowledge and comprehension. How ... perceive would suggest an approach more akin to phenomenology, but you use a strict quantitative count.</p> <p>Suggestion: 1.) Describe a methodology/method. 2.) Clarify you are testing students about knowledge and comprehension of standards/curriculum and not perceptions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	USA