

Review form 1.7

Journal name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript number:	Mrs_AJESS_101602
Manuscript Title:	DEVELOPMENT OF A COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL TO IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF MATHEMATICAL GENERALIZATION OF ELEMENTARY SECONDARY STUDENTS
Item Type	Original Research Article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the 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 comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p><u>Mandatory</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the 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 any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript presents the following arguments that make it important in the scientific field: The keywords must be worked with the UNESCO THESAURI, which is a universal glossary, allows the development of the topic as well as the location of the article when it is published. Education – Mathematics – Cooperative learning...</p> <p>The problem is clearly determined. The justification revolves around the Constructivist pedagogical model. At the same time, the contribution of collaborative learning, motivation and other elements that facilitate the development of thought is recognized. Well treated.</p> <p>The context data is weak, the selected population is appropriate, the design established for this Plomp model case is relevant; the techniques used are adjusted to the study and the formulas for the validation of the results are pertinent.</p> <p>The results are verified with similar studies and reveals the new contributions of this research. The lines of investigation are appreciated in the recommendation, it is suggested to locate in the discussion.</p> <p>The conclusion responds to the objective of the proposed investigation.</p> <p>2. Suggested: Cooperative learning models using the mathematical generalization ability of high school students</p> <p>3. It is important to determine the general objective of the study, it is not necessary to indicate the specific objectives. The methodology of the process is clear, the results show the achievement of the objective in a brief way. It is necessary to briefly determine the conclusion of the study.</p> <p>4. The structure for the scientific article is adequate</p> <p>5. It is acceptable</p> <p>6. References are appropriate to the proposed topic.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>	Appropriate	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Review form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador