

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_129918
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Cognitive Level of Preservice Mathematics Teachers Towards the "Pseudo-Understanding Phenomenon"
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Research on the cognitive level of preservice mathematics teachers is crucial for identifying and addressing the "pseudo-understanding phenomenon" where teachers may appear to understand mathematical concepts without fully knowing them. By examining how preservice teachers process and internalize mathematical ideas, researchers can identify shortages in their conceptual knowledge and teaching practices. Thus, understanding this phenomenon allows for the development of more effective teaching practice and teacher training that promote deeper, more authentic understanding of mathematics. In due course, this manuscript can contribute to improve the quality of mathematics education and enhancing future teachers' ability to foster accurate comprehension for their students.	Thank you for your comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you for your comments.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract lacks clarity. Over fifty percent of the abstract consists only of views it receives starting from "Data analysis reveals that most people...". There are no substantial references for the results, implications, and recommendations for further research. I suggest the author to focus on important findings, implications of the study on preservice math educators, policymakers and developers. Also, the author can highlight some important implications of the study, and suggestions for future research.	Thank you for your comments, we have modified.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The structure is ok, but the content is not. The author had to focus more on the main themes and rethink about the research method.	Thank you for your comments, we have modified.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author must reevaluate the references. A substantial section of the literature pertains to studies on this topic. Nevertheless, the majority of the referenced research are outdated; the author has to update them.	Thank you for your suggestions. We have removed some outdated references and updated some of the documents. However, some of the references are of great significance to the article, and the things cited are still convincing to this day.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article requires proofreading by a native English speaker.	Thank you for your comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My primary concerns as a reviewer are the data collection tool, sample size, and data analysis process which I don't find it well performed nor written in this article and broke the role of trustworthiness. However, the author of this manuscript employed a questionnaire to collect data on cognitive processes, namely mental activity and behavioural performance. All prior literature on the relevant concerns employed mixed methods to investigate similar topics such as think-aloud protocols, survey questionnaires, and structured interviews. In addition, the sample size should be about 100 or more, contingent upon specific circumstances outlined in the literature. Finally, data analysis should be conducted using recognised statistical tools in accordance with established analytical frameworks, such as the measurement model and structural model.	Thank you for your comments, we have modified.

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>	