

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96931
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Cultivation Strategy of Junior Middle School Students ' Mathematical Innovation Consciousness
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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. Unfortunately, it is just related to Chinese community. The results cannot be generalized to other society 2. The topic does match with the information inside the text. It should be revised to refer to the body of the research 3. No, it should be revised based on content and academic language, esp using gerund rather infinitive for itimzing phrases in abstract and inside the text 4. The headings can be written better based on a format of review paper. 5. It is a review paper and can be interesting but the paper should be revised based on language. There are a lot of redundancies like using "point out" a lot of times and using the same structure for many times. 6. There is no variety in using references. In fact, they have been selected just from China. Internationally speaking, they have to be revised based on number and country	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Alireza Karbalaei</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Farhangian University, Iran</b>