

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_116017
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Junior High School Mathematics Textbooks between People's Education Press Version and Gyeonggi Province Department of Education Version—Taking "similar triangles" as an example
Type of the Article	

### 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>1. the manuscript lacked the cohesion and coherence among the passages. As highlighted, the text needs to be revised because of plenty of mechanical errors. In addition, the review of the related literature was not comprehensive. The discourse is not scientific, unfortunately.</p> <p>2. A Comparative Study of Junior High School Mathematics Textbooks between People's Education Press Version and Gyeonggi Province Department of Education Version: The Case of Similar Triangles</p> <p>3. The abstract was not acceptable and informative. It should be revised. For instance, the personal pronouns "we" was used but in the scientific article it is better to use other structures such as passive voice. It needs to be revised for grammatical errors as highlighted.</p> <p>4. The order of the sections and subsections needs to be revised. Some section are too long and the other one are too short such as conclusion.</p> <p>5. Since the references were restricted to one part of the word, it must cover the larger areas. Discussion and conclusion are too short. There is no justification in these sections.</p> <p>7. The references are limited to one area _i think only China_ without mentioning the other parts of the world such as Europe and the America. Therefore, the scientific nature of the text is doubtful. In addition, the other references can be added.</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 mechanical errors are too serious as highlighted in the manuscript. For scholarly communications and communities, the manuscript should be revised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript lacks the firm structures and the sentences and paragraphs should be connected with another in an appropriate way both technically and scientifically.</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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammad Javad Ansari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Iran</b>