

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_96929</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Research on the Cultivation Strategy of Junior Middle School Student's Mathematics Operation Ability under the Background of Core Literacy</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The results of this study are able to provide information about improving students' mathematical operations skills, especially in China. This study provides information about various mathematical operations learning strategies used by teachers in China by taking 39 research samples. Researchers analyzed each article based on two aspects, namely categories and research methods. The researcher tries to provide an overview of 39 article that focuses on learning strategies based on five categories, namely knowledge, skills, thinking, teaching concepts and teaching methods, and non-intellectual factors.</p> <p>In addition, researchers classify articles in terms of research methods. He/She found that there were 5 methods: Literature method (39), Questionnaire method (4), Interview method (2), Observation method (2), Analysis method (3).</p> <p>However, in the discussion, researchers only describe the contents of each article. In each discussion the researcher try to provides recommendations on new variables that are not examined. Such as: researchers recommend research on psychological aspects, <b>"In the future, researchers can start with student psychology to change students' learning concepts and attitudes toward core literacy"</b> even though this category (<i>student psychology</i>) does not fall into the five categories set.</p> <p>The authors recommend quantitative research, <b>"Future researchers need to use quantitative methods to study this topic"</b> although none of the reviewed articles used quantitative methods. <b>To complete the description, the author is expected to focus more on:</b></p> <p>1. <b>What can the reader get from the results of this research? For example, researchers explain how teachers teach mathematical operations based on knowledge, skills, etc</b></p> <p>2. <b>What can readers get from this article? For example, qualitative research is not just a literature study, it should be combined with bla..bla... so that it strengthens qualitative research, so that the research results are more comprehensive.</b></p> <p>ok</p> <p><b>No recommendations yet. Recommendations must be related to the results and why other people should read this article, what is the urgency of this article in operations mathematics teaching and learning.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but the recommendations in the discussion sub-results need to be reconsidered in this article, it is not clear what the problem is, and what solutions are provided by researchers from the problem</b></p> <p>Reference sufficient, <b>however, articles from other countries should be taken as comparison material</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The writing procedure is quite good, the sentences written in each paragraph are easy to read and understand</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Gelar Dwirahayu
Department, University & Country	UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia