

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJESS_117722
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the Cognition of Pre-service Mathematics Teachers about the Usage of PPT in Mathematics Teaching in China
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1.The manuscript deals with preservice teachers' cognition and the value of PowerPoint usage in the didactical process. This is an important topic as it can contribute to more effective learning of mathematics which is in crisis.</p> <p>Pre-service Teachers perceptions about the Usage of PowerPoint in Mathematics Teaching in China</p> <p>I suggest removing the abbreviation from the title and include the PowerPoint instead.</p> <p>3. The abstract provides the important aspects of research. However, I suggest that: a) the removal of numbering and shortening of those points, b) state what theoretical framework is used and c) comment on the research methodology used in this research work.</p> <p>4. The sections and sub-sections are well organized. The conclusion section is well written and future research work in this area of expertise is suggested by the author(s).</p> <p>5. The paper is written in the normal expected style when reporting on an empirical study.</p> <p>4. The references are recent and pertinent to this study. The author(s) can include the content presented in Zulu, S., & Brijlall,D. (2024). Multilingual pre-service teachers' knowledge and understanding of analytic geometry content. Gulf Journal of Mathematics, 16 (2), 111-121. https://doi.org/10.56947/gjom.v16i2.1873. This study provides a different angle to how preservice teachers understand analytical geometry but the author(s) in this paper can make a case showing how PowerPoint usage can contribute to such a study. Such discussion will provide a stronger rationale for the study reported in this manuscript.</p> <p>a) I suggest that the research questions be explicitly stated in the introduction. The author(s) can write: For this study the research question is: How should mathematics teachers effectively use PPT? In other words, the main research question must be made conspicuous to the reader and not hidden in the text. The author(s) do mention three questions but they are written as "issues" in section 2.2.3</p> <p>b) In section 2 first sentence, it should be written as: At present, there has been many research studies on....</p> <p>c) The hypotheses in this paper need to be removed. This is a qualitative study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Given that the author(s) are probably second language English speakers the ideas presented are clear.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The serious shortcoming in this research study is the lack of other data capture tools. The study merely used an open-ended interview. There was no other tool that was employed to provide a triangulation of the interview data.</p> <p>The author(s) used the terminology of reliability and validity which are phenomena relevant to a quantitative study. They should resort to conformity which is relevant to qualitative studies.</p>	

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:	Deonarain Brijlall
Department, University & Country	Durban University of Technology, South Africa