



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_66952
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Making Mathematics More Friendly; A Thoughtful Review of Problem Solving Concept as a Tool</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The subject addressed in the text is interesting and the authors propose the adoption of different methodologies in the classroom, such as problem solving, centered on concrete situations, to teach and learn mathematics.</p> <p>They emphasize that teaching should not be teacher-centered and that effective methodologies for teaching and learning mathematics should be used regularly and not as a pedagogical experience.</p> <p>However, I have some suggestions to improve the article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The research question and the methodology used are not clear.</li> <li>2) Improve the written English (e.g.: In page 3 is written: "The National Research Council (1989) agreed that effective teachers as those who can stimulate students to learn mathematics" is grammatically wrong, or the incomplete sentence in page 4 "and not just what they are doing, but to know how and why those routines and procedures,"), this sentences and others along the text should be written.</li> <li>3) It is not clear the use of the term Pedagogical Content Awareness, is it equivalent to PCK propose by Shulman?</li> <li>4) In page 7 is missing a reference to "minimal disruptive behavior"</li> <li>5) Try to include more recent references. A large number of used references are close to or over twenty years old.</li> <li>6) Some references are not correctly made. Check the punctuation, italics, ...</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<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>Alexandra Sofia da Cunha Rodrigues</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto de Gouveia - Escola Profissional, Gouveia, Portugal</b>