

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_106853</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Research on Preservice Mathematics Teachers' Cognitive Degree of Space Concept Literacy in Junior High Schools in China</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research paper</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The manuscript is part of the area of research specific to the didactics of the specialization (mathematics) and addresses an important topic in the field of education in China. The title (relating to spatial literacy) is clear and in line with the Mathematics Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education.</li> <li>- The abstract is comprehensive and the keywords are relevant to the topic studied (4-8 keywords are recommended – add one or two more).</li> <li>- The structure of the manuscript is logical and includes a theoretical foundation and an applied research part. The research questions, the research method used and the research results are specified.</li> <li>- The reference to the tables in which the obtained information is presented gives the manuscript more consistency. The analysis of these in the Discussion section answers the research questions. The conclusions are relevant and the references are rich and up-to-date.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We suggest a better systematization of sub-sections 5.4 and 5.5, checking technical editing and respecting the recommendations regarding the length of the manuscript (3000-4000 words).</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ilie Vali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Craiova, Romania</b>