

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_101080
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effectiveness of Know-Want-Learn (KWL) Strategy on Ghanaian Basic Five Pupils' Achievements in Mathematics.
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.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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community. There is no doubt that there are many countries revising their educational curriculum to meet the demand of 21st century students at all levels. It is crucial to discuss the study of mathematics. 2. The title is suitable (The effectiveness of Know-Want-Learn (KWL) Strategy on Ghanaian Basic Five Pupils' Achievements in Mathematics). 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and shows the method and results. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. There are more up-to-date international references. Authors should look for them so that the article has greater impact. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of the English language is adequate for a scientific work. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Soniárlei Vieira Leite
Department, University & Country	Universidade Veiga De Almeida, Brazil