

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_83019
Title of the Manuscript:	Educators' beliefs on the gender difference in mathematics performance of their students
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract subsection generally contains the research background, objectives, methods, and findings explicitly. Therefore, you need to add the research background to show the reasons or background why this research needs to be done (explicitly) in the Abstract subsection. Please add it. 2. Please remove the brackets in keywords because this does not match the AJESS (Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies) keyword writing template format. Thank You 3. In Introduction subsection: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The gap analysis in your article of why research needs to be done is inadequate. It is necessary to analyze what the previous researchers have done and show the gaps that need a solution for this research. So show the importance of this research. Please, add it. (b) In Background subtitle, related to the statement that the author wrote in the last paragraph of page 1 and the first paragraph on page 2 or in the sentence "..... in the population that male students can perform better in mathematics than female students"; The reviewers have checked the statement in sources at the Bhutan Council for School Examinations & Assessment ... Summary of Education Statistics 2018. The results of the check show that there are no statements or graphs and tables showing that "in the population that male students can perform better in mathematics than female students". Please re-check and revise it. (c) In Problem Statement subtitle, related to the statement that the author wrote in the sub-heading Problem statement, first paragraph, in the sentence "..... it is found that the girls have consistently underperformed boys in mathematics"; The reviewer has also examined the statement in sources at Bhutan's Board of Examinations & School Assessments... Education Statistics Summary 2018. Examination results show that there are no statements or graphs and tables to state such a thing. On the other hand, the reviewers found that "female students were more motivated to learn and were less likely to drop out of school than male students". Please recheck and revise. 4. In Literature Review subsection, Reviewers also check the reference "1. Ajai JT, Imoko BI. Gender Differences in Mathematics Achievement and Retention Scores: A Case of Problem-Based Learning Method. International Journal of research in Education and Science. 2015" related to the statement in your manuscript, at page 2, in the Literature Review subtitle, first paragraph, that "... boys perform better than girls in mathematics and more so, boys outperform girls in achieving higher scores than girls on a standardized test". Your statement is a statement that does not correspond to the actual results of the research in the article. The article concludes that "student achievement and retention in algebra does not depend on gender, but on a function of the method. Both sexes are able to compete and collaborate in classroom activities". So the statement in your manuscript is not true. Please recheck??? 5. In Result and Discussion subsection On page 5, in the Results and Discussion subsection, the second paragraph, Regarding the questionnaire on the level of confidence in the resistance to math exercises that are considered difficult between male and female students with the results of 78 of 99 male students and 73 of 99 female students, you cannot judge as significantly different. Scientifically, this must pass a statistical test (two-sample independent t-test) whether the significant result is lower or greater than the alpha value. Normally the significant level used is 5% or the alpha value is 0.05. Reviewers did not see any such statistical test in your manuscript. In other words, the conclusion that the authors draw that "participants believe that male students show more endurance if the maths exercises are considered to be difficult. That is 78 out of 99 male students to 73 out of 99 female students " is not necessarily true, or it can be there is no difference from the results of statistical tests. Include the results of the statistical test in the discussion in this manuscript?? 6. In Conclusion subsection, the conclusion of the paper should not only enclose the findings of the research but must also include a description of the novelty of the work/study produced, as well as pointing out the weaknesses of the work being carried out to be proposed as 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>further work/research. Please considering to add it.</p> <p>7. In Reference subtitle:</p> <p>(a) Reviewer did not see you using references published by AJESS (Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies). The article of AJESS (Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies) is an open-access , so you can get the latest references in PDF files and related to your article topic. Please cite article from the AJESS (Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies).</p> <p>(b) Reference 3 and 4 from the Bhutan Council for School Examinations and Assessment source is not a reference to a scientific article. So it is not suitable to be used as a reference in scientific articles. Reviewers recommend that these references be replaced with other references or other scientific articles.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	In Recommendation subsection, it is better to combine the Recommendation subtitle with the Conclusion subtitle so that it becomes one CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION subtitle. Consider combining them. Thank You	
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Anthony Anggrawan
Department, University & Country	Bumigora University, Indonesia