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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	• The manuscript is important for scientific community. However, the title is not suitable. Please see suggested title in the reviewed manuscript. • The author (s) should reconcile the term cognition and recognition. • Send the objectives and hypothesis to the introduction section. • Please indicate the sampling method used to get the sample. • The study compares the findings with that of previous studies. There is no enough justification for that. Again, there is no adequate methodological support. • … In this paper, previous studies on the usage of PPT in mathematics teaching are sorted out and counted…. How many previous studies were sorted and counted? On what bases were those studies selected? What methodologies were used? Who are the authors? • The use of the term previous studies is too general, what are you comparing? The author (s) need to be specific on what they are comparing. • Discussion of the findings not done well. • I suggest the authors report the findings of similar studies in a discussion of the findings of the current study. • The author (s) should be specific on the use of the term 'items' in the results section. E.g are they codes, themes etc. • There are issues with presentation of the findings. The presentation of results is not clear. • Present results based on the research questions. • Review of literature not appropriate for scholarly work. E.g … Wu, Liang, Cui, Huang, Chen and other 15 scholars pointed out that teachers should use the dynamic display function of PPT to show the process of knowledge formation [**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**,**Error! Reference source not found.**].	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language is suitable, however, there few grammatical issues. The author (s) should avoid long sentences. There are issues with punctuations.	
Optional/General comments	The author (s) should indicate the approach and design used in the study. For example, if qualitative approach, is it a case study design? Phenomenology? Etc. There are issues with presentation of results. Some results are not part of research objectives. E.g. results on previous studies.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Philip Dorsah**
Department, University & Country	**C. K. Tedam University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ghana**