

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_108223
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Implementation of Space Concept Literacy in the Junior High School Mathematics Classroom Teaching in China
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>The article is of limited importance for the scientific community because it only “puts forward four strategies for the implementation of space concept literacy in the classrooms” (see Abstract). It would have been much more useful to carry out a study to determine to what extent the “four strategies” produce the desired results.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>The title is not at all appropriate. The work presented in the manuscript cannot be considered as research, because it lacks a methodology, so the word “research” should be deleted from the title. Also, the term “space concept literacy” is very ambiguous and is not precisely defined in the manuscript. Two statements that support this assertion are: (1) “Based on clarifying the connotations and requirements of space concept literacy ...” (Abstract), and (2) “... space concept literacy connotes the cognition of the shape, size, and positional relationships of objects or figures.” (first sentence of section 2). The authors cite China’s “Mathematics Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education”, so it seems that they really refer to <i>spatial literacy</i> instead of “space concept literacy”. In the following paper: <i>Urban Education</i> 2021, vol. 56(1) 61-90, the term “space literacy” has a different meaning to that given by the authors of the submitted manuscript.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>The manuscript has six subsections, besides the Abstract: (1) Introduction, (2) Connotations and Requirements, (3) The Current Situation of Mathematics Classroom Teaching, (4) Strategies, (5) Conclusions, and (6) References. These are not the usual subsections of a scientific article. In fact, I don’t understand what type of manuscript is this one.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The authors do not explain how did they came up with the “four strategies for the implementation of space concept literacy”. Also, as already mentioned, the term “space concept literacy” is not precisely defined. The article is very ambiguous (to the point that section 2 is called “connotations”) and imprecise (“requirements” for what? see section 2).</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>All the cited works seem to have been recently published in China. There is a bias both in the selected literature and the standpoint of the studied subject. I suggest to the authors to check the bibliography on “spatial literacy” published outside China (otherwise, the paper will only be of interest for mathematics Chinese teachers). Two additional references are: (1) “The PISA 2018 Assessment and Analytical Framework” published by OECD, and (2) “Education for All- Literacy for Life” published in 2006 by UNESCO.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	a) I suggest to avoid using terms like “digging out” (Abstract). b) What do you mean by “abstract geometric theory knowledge”? (second paragraph of section 4.2). c) The phrase: “improve the undesirable phenomenon” is nonsense (section 4).	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebeca Aguirre Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico