

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Mathematics and Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMCS_115676
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Elementary School Mathematics Textbooks in China, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, America, Germany: A Case Study on "Fraction Division"
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly within the field of elementary school mathematics education since it gives insights into the differences and similarities in teaching approaches across different educational systems. This comparative analysis has information for educators and curriculum developers. It helps them understand how various countries approach the teaching of fraction division. 2. The title of the manuscript is suitable and conveys the scope and focus of the study. It shows the comparative nature of the research and specifies the countries under investigation. 3. In the abstract, please clarify the study's scope and significance by writing a clear overview of the research objectives, methods, and key findings. Moreover, please provide a concise overview of the mathematics education implications arising from the variations in fraction division representation and arithmetic across textbooks published in different nations. Lastly, please provide a clear statement of the study's contributions to the field, such as offering insights into teaching methods for fraction division. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for organizing the study's content and guiding readers through the comparative analysis. 5. The manuscript conforms to well-established principles and standards of research. It has a rigorous approach through its comparative analysis of elementary school mathematics textbooks from six countries on the topic of fraction division. The study holds frameworks and methodologies, such as Jia Suijun's reasoning model and Ma Liping's models of fraction division operation, to guide the analysis. Additionally, the inclusion of references to previous research and theoretical foundations further enhances the scientific validity of the study. 6. The list of references included in the manuscript covers an extensive array of sources that are pertinent to the research on fraction division and elementary school mathematics education. The compilation comprises academic publications, including discussions on the challenges of fraction exercises and conceptual comprehension in mathematics education, alongside seminal works authored by esteemed figures in the discipline, such as Ma Liping. Nevertheless, please use more recent publications in order to guarantee the incorporation of the most recent advancements in research and viewpoints within the discipline. 7. Please give a more detailed summary of the study's specific goals and objectives in the introduction. Furthermore, please offer a more analysis of the present research on fraction division education, emphasizing any significant gaps or points of disagreement. 8. In the research method section, please provide more detailed criteria for the textbook selection process. Additionally, please further elaborate on how utilization of established frameworks by Jia Suijun and Ma Liping were applied in the analysis. Moreover, please include information on the specific data collection and analysis methods employed, such as content analysis or qualitative coding procedures. 9. In the conclusion, please write a more explicit discussion of the broader implications of key findings regarding the differences in representation models and arithmetic reasoning methods for fraction division across different countries' textbooks for mathematics education policy and practice. Furthermore, please provide a more synthesis of the study's contributions to the existing literature on fraction division education, including any novel insights or areas for future research. Besides, please offer specific recommendations for educators or policymakers based on the study's findings. 10. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. However, some minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings could be improved for better clarity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The manuscript shows an effort in comparing elementary school mathematics textbooks from various countries on the topic of fraction division, however, there are several areas that could be improved. Firstly, please strengthen the introduction by providing more detailed background information on the significance of fraction division in elementary mathematics education and its broader implications. Additionally, please write a clearer explanation of the criteria used to select the textbooks for comparison and the specific methods employed for analysis for the research design section. Furthermore, please write more integration on the suggestions provided for improving teaching methods with the comparative analysis to provide a deeper understanding of the differences observed in the textbooks. Moreover, the conclusion could be expanded to discuss the implications of the findings in a broader context and suggest potential avenues for future research.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	I Putu Andre Suhardiana
Department, University & Country	Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, Indonesia