

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_130211
Title of the Manuscript:	Pre-service mathematics teachers' understanding of "being able to understand but unable to solve"
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author (s)'s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that author (s)s should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This study is relevant as it centres on students' problem-solving skills and abilities, which are essential competencies for students in the 21st century.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title does not align with the research questions. The author (s) should recognize that the concept of "understanding" is not the same as "awareness." Additionally, the phrase "being able to understand but unable to solve" introduces ambiguity. However, since the research focuses on exploring why senior high school students struggle to solve mathematics problems during assessments, the title could be revised for clarity. A suggested revision is: <b>Pre-service Mathematics Teachers' Awareness of Factors Contributing to Senior High School Students' Difficulties in Solving Mathematics Problems.</b>	
<b>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.</b>	There is a discrepancy between the sample size mentioned in the abstract and the methodology. The abstract states a total of 30 participants, comprising both post-graduates and undergraduates, while the methodology specifies 60 participants, with 30 from each group. Additionally, the abstract should be reframed to provide a clearer summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically weak due to a poorly developed methodology, the absence of a theoretical framework, and the inadequate integration of the findings with existing literature in the discussion.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	All the references are recent but they are woefully inadequate, with no citations included in the introduction. The author (s) should ensure that key arguments are properly referenced. For example, statements such as, "At present, many scholars have found in front-line teaching that many high school students appear 'able to understand but unable to solve' phenomenon" and "Most of the current studies are from the perspective of front-line teaching, and no one has explored the reasons and countermeasures from the perspective of pre-service mathematics teachers," lack supporting references to previous studies. Without proper citation, these claims are invalid, making the identification of the research gap unsubstantiated.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The paper is moderately structured and generally easy to follow and read. However, there is still room for proofreading and editing to improve the clarity and flow of certain sections.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> The introduction lacks the academic rigor required for scholarly consumption, as it does not reference any academic literature. Additionally, there is no clear problem statement that justifies the need for the research or outlines the study's contribution. Therefore, the introduction should be redeveloped to include relevant references and a well-defined problem statement to support the research's significance and contribution.</p> <p><b>Research Questions</b> Research question 2 and 3 should be revised.</p> <p><b>Literature review</b> Although several literature have been presented, no proper review has been conducted. The author (s) has simply listed the assertions of other author (s) without evaluating or synthesizing them into a cohesive review. The author (s) should conduct an empirical review to critically assess existing literature, identify gaps, and provide a more robust foundation for the research. The tables in the literature review should also be deleted.</p> <p><b>Methodology</b> The methodology requires significant improvement. The research design employed should be clearly stated. Additionally, discrepancies in the sample size need to be corrected, and the sampling technique used to select participants should be explained with appropriate justifications. The authors should clarify the data collection tool used, emphasizing that an interview is a method of data collection, not a tool. If interviews were conducted, the specific type of interview guide used (structured, semi-structured, or unstructured) should be clearly identified. Furthermore, the validity and reliability (trustworthiness) of the findings should be explained, and ethical considerations should be provided.</p> <p><b>Results</b> The findings presented do not align with the data collection method and the research questions. Notably, there is no clear presentation of findings for research questions 2 and 3. While the methodology suggests a qualitative study, the findings appear to reflect a quantitative approach, highlighting a disconnect between the research method and the findings. This inconsistency suggests that the researcher(s) lack a thorough understanding of the research problem and process.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Benjamin Takyi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Education Winneba, Ghana</b></p>