

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96968
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Mathematical Reasoning Ability in Junior High Schools 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>	<b>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community.</b> <b>2. The title of the article is comprehensive.</b> <b>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b> <b>4. Subsections and structure are scientifically correct.</b> <b>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b> <b>6. The references are sufficient however the in-text citations are not well done. There is need to re-work on them. For instance:</b> Yang pointed out that junior high school students' mathematical logic reasoning ability was generally at a good level, and deductive reasoning was better than plausible reasoning (Yang, 2020). The author is mentioned in the sentence twice, there is need to drop one.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is ok	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A well thought out paper.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Robert Kati
Department, University & Country	Kibabii University, Kenya