

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_101602
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL TO IMPROVE MATHEMATIC GENERALIZATION ABILITY OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
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>)

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. The study needs more information to be included to make it valid for publication.</p> <p>a. The voices of the interviewees have to be felt in the study</p> <p>b. Data analysis tables should be seen rather than mentioning of mere figures</p> <p>c. If possible, there must be a conceptual diagram to show the flow of ideas in the model</p> <p>d. The data analysis of each study aim can be done separately to improve the paper</p> <p>2. If all the suggested changes are made then the title can be upheld.</p> <p>3. Abstract</p> <p>a. Some sentences in the abstract should be revised for clear understanding.</p> <p>b. how the five phases in the adopted model was stated should be check</p> <p>c. The results did not talk about the third aim of the study. Why?</p> <p>d. the concluding statement of the abstract has no bearing with the topic or the study aims</p> <p>4. changes have to be made as suggested in point number one (1)</p> <p>5. A lot of relevant additions and proof reading are to be made to improve the quality of the paper</p> <p>6. No issues on the references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Proof reading is needed to improve the quality of the language and presentation	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	If the suggested changes are made, therefore the paper can be considered for publication	

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:	Evans Atteh
Department, University & Country	Wiawso College of Education, Ghana