

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_89367
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Grade Six Students' Mathematics Achievement through the Use of Cooperative Learning Strategy: An Action Research
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 1.6**

**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><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why we need to know where the study was developed at the abstract? As reader, when I am reading an abstract I need to know why this is interesting for the international audience. The international audience does not interest in knowing something special for a region. We will understand information about the sample and the characteristics of the specific circumstances at the section of methodology.</li> <li>A study can use qualitative or quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative data in order to answer the research questions. I believe that authors have to delete the sentence that a positive correlation between qualitative and quantitative findings revealed.</li> </ol> <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although I am an academics on the domain of mathematics education, I cannot accept to have a presentation of mathematics as a science which is higher in comparison to other studies. It is better to present an interdisciplinary perspective according to which mathematics is related positively and creatively with other sciences.</li> <li>I believe that at this point of the manuscript authors have to explain the ages they are talking. There are contradictory results about the cooperative learning which mainly depend on the age and there are studies which relate the cooperative learning with inquiry-based learning or problem-based learning or project-based learning etc.</li> </ol> <p>Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When I was reading at the previous sections about the quantitative data I was expecting a bigger sample of students. Explain further why only this number of students.</li> <li>Previously authors talked about 6<sup>th</sup> graders. How is it possible to have a range at the age of 10-13 years?</li> <li>Research instrument: indicative examples of the tasks would be helpful.</li> <li>We need to know about the duration of the intervention in relation to further information about this intervention. We know that it was for 3 months, however which was the frequency of the teaching of mathematics, how often the specific teaching method was used, how etc.</li> <li>How the qualitative results were analysed? Based on which methodology?</li> </ol> <p>Analysis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relate the types of analyses with the posed research aims.</li> </ol> <p>Findings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sample is too small to have those types of analyses.</li> <li>How do we know that the improvement was the result of the intervention? Explain for example why there was not a control group or how do you know the expected development or improvement of the performance for those 3 months.</li> <li>The analysis of the qualitative data is too poor. We have only the indicative opinion of few students.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Rita Panaoura</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Frederick University, Cyprus</b>