

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96882
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on Abstraction Ability under the Background of Mathematics Key Competencies in Junior High School in China
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The manuscript is relevant to the current need for research. The title of the article can be improved. The word "research" can be omitted because it is already understood that a research endeavour was made. The abstract does not contain the research objectives specific to the study and the methodology, There was a discussion of data collection, however the criterion for the inclusion of the literature was not mentioned (e.g date of publication of the literature, quality, etc.). References are sufficient and updated.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Consider editing by a professional editor.	
Optional/General 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rowena Imelda A. Ramos
Department, University & Country	Adventist University of the Philippines, Philippines