

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_117134</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Effect of Implementing Learning Models Cycle 7e on Solving Ability Mathematical Problems</b>
Type of the 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> )

**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><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>	<p>1. Yes it is very important. Since it is trying to address alternative ways of solving ability in mathematical problems using 7E model.</p> <p>2. The topic is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is okay, but I feel there are areas left that when any reader may have some gaps to understand the document. Example it is important to give the objective, the findings and conclusion to be specific and not general so that the gap of the researcher is trying to address is clearly.</p> <p>4. I tend to propose that the researcher took more time on introduction and have left a lot of subsection of the manuscript from introductions moves to methods, result analysis and main areas left behind need to incorporate to makes the standard that is needed.</p> <p>5. Its okay need only be edited.</p> <p>6. The reference are recent and okay The only challenge is that they have not been indicated in <b>APA</b> format in the body of the document and not consistent example use of “&amp;” instead of “and” (Lesi &amp; Husen, 2017). (Hewi &amp; Shaleh, 2020). (Af-idah &amp; Suhendar, 2020).(Unaenah &amp; Rahmah, 2019),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>.The tables 1,2,3 and 4is not in APA format as recommended should be adjusted accordingly</b></li> <li>• <b>Table 4 and the analysis of the figures has errors that should be addressed I also feel the table 2 and the discussion from the table are not rhyming</b></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>It is okey</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Kindly I have stated them in point no 6 above.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>John Gathage Kunga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kirinyaga University, Kenya</b>