

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_130263
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Writing Characteristics of "Statistics and Probability" in Junior High School Mathematics Textbooks between China and the United States
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.	This text provides a detailed comparative analysis between Chinese and American mathematics textbooks, highlighting essential differences in the approach to teaching "statistics and probability." The research contributes to the field of mathematics education by examining the various pedagogical strategies employed in different cultural and educational contexts. Additionally, the manuscript offers valuable insights into how content can be structured to meet students' needs, improving teaching and the development of statistical thinking. Lastly, this analysis can help guide future curriculum reforms and teacher training on an international level.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is suitable	
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.	It is quite complete and structured	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The careful analysis is quite cohesive, with careful and accurate conclusions	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	you should review the bibliographic references and indicate some more recent authors.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sofia Maria Veríssimo Catarreira
Department, University & Country	Instituto Politécnico de Portalegre, Portugal