

### 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>

### Review Form 3

#### 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.	The manuscript would have contributed to the scientific community but the author(s) have not linked the results to the research questions and this should be checked properly. The discussion has not also been done well by using the literature to justify the results or findings of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title: Pre-service mathematics teachers' understanding of "being able to understand but unable to solve" is clear, straight forward and suitable for the paper. I would have suggested the inverted commas be deleted from the title but rather be used in the text to emphasise the relevance of the statement.	
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 some key components such as the methods used, sampling technique, setting, key finding and conclusion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript needs serious and major revisions to make it scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are good but I have a problem with the in-text citations which I wish the author should look at critically and at the reference page too in APA format for the 7 <sup>th</sup> edition.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is acumen and clear.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should state each research question and its results in the manuscript.	

#### 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:	Hamidu Ibrahim Bukari
Department, University & Country	C.K. Tedam University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ghana