

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_83193
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Cognitive Degree of Pre-service High School Mathematics Teachers on the implementation for Data Analysis Literacy
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	<p>ABSTRACT.</p> <p>The abstract may include the selection of the research design (qualitative, quantitative or mixed design). According to the information given in the article, the research design is quantitative and the research level is descriptive.</p> <p>Include the research objectives and the purpose of the study.</p> <p>Include sampling method.</p> <p>The conclusions given in the abstract should be equal to the conclusions given in SECTION CONCLUSIONS.</p> <p>It is necessary to give 4-8 keywords.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>We suggest to improve the introduction. For example, the introduction may include identifying the research problem or issue, framing this problem within the existing literature, pointing out deficiencies in the literature, and targeting the study for an audience.</p> <p>Include the research objectives. Clearly define the research problem, proposed solution, and justification of the work done.</p> <p>Include purpose of the study and how this study will be delimited.</p> <p>In our opinion, it is necessary to identify clear and accurate the research questions that will be answered, and based on the research data give answers to these questions.</p> <p>LITERATURE REVIEW</p> <p>Wang, Y. (2020) and Chang, L., and Bao, J. S. (2017) are not cited in-text references.</p> <p>The citations in-text do not follow the recommendations given by the Journal. For example, He (2018), Liu (2020),Wu et al. (2021)...</p> <p>There are not electronic references. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies is an electronic journal, therefore it is convenient to include some actual electronic references.</p> <p>We suggest to follow the recommendations given by the Journal.</p> <p>We suggest to include definitions of the following variables: cognitive scope, cognitive focus, understanding of training strategies, cognitive validity, and cognitive rationality.</p> <p>METHODOLOGY.</p> <p>There are not research questions, objectives, and hypotheses.</p> <p>We suggest to do a better description of the sample to enrich the description of the sample participants (age, origen, sections, geographical region ...).</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Include the research design (the research had a quantitative design) and the research level (the research level was descriptive).</p> <p>The author does not provide detailed information about the instrument used to obtain the research data. Please consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Name the survey instrument used to collect data. Discuss whether it is an instrument designed for this research, a modified instrument, or an intact instrument developed by someone else. If it is a modified instrument, indicate whether the developer has provided appropriate permission to use it.• To use an existing instrument, describe the established validity and reliability of scores obtained from past use of the instrument. <p>We suggest to comment on the sampling method (a systematic or probabilistic sample, a nonprobability sample or convenience sample ...) and the research limitations</p> <p>Explain the reason for the sample selection.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>The discussion does not have all necessary or normal parts. For example, the data given in section RESULTS involve cognitive scope, cognitive focus, understanding of training strategies, cognitive rationality, and cognitive validity. However, the discussions about understanding of training strategies and cognitive validity were omitted.</p> <p>Note. Table 2 given in section RESULT (Cognitive SCOPE) is very hard to understand.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS.</p> <p>The conclusions should briefly state the major findings of the study. The conclusions should be equal to the conclusions given in the abstract.</p> <p>The conclusions should be related to the research data. The conclusions should include cognitive scope, cognitive focus, understanding of training strategies, cognitive validity, and cognitive rationality. There are not conclusions about some of these variables. Some conclusions are based on the research data.</p> <p>We suggest to include the research limitations and recommendations for conducting additional research.</p> <p>REFERENCES.</p> <p>The citations in-text does not follow the recommendations given by the Journal. We suggest to follow the recommendations given by the Journal.</p> <p>Some references cited in the references list are not cited in-text.</p> <p>Some references are very hard to find.</p> <p>There are not electronic references. We suggest to use both the free, online literature databases as well as those available through your academic library.</p> <p>The references are actual references.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The research theme is interesting. .	
Optional/General comments	We suggest to make a general review of in-text references, the references list, and to adopt the recommendations given by the Journal.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesús Marcos Segura Martín
Department, University & Country	Venezuela