



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_66418
Title of the Manuscript:	WORKTEXT IN PRECALCULUS: EVALUATION AND ACCEPTABILITY
Type of the Article	Original Research

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>I consider that the paper is moderately relevant. However, the article is not technically sound. In addition, you do not carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of your contributions. Their claims are weakly supported. The article does not offer a new form of evidence in favor of learning. The theoretical analysis of previous experimental results is very little addressed.</p> <p>The paper is swell written, but it does not motivate research. The results should be better written and evaluated. Though the paper is organized in a logical fashion, is written in clear English. The readability is good, and there are not any presentation problems.</p> <p>This paper is not a novel combination of existing techniques. In the results and discussion section, I consider it very important to include the process of how the textbook was evaluated, what the instrument was, how it was built, if it was subjected to validation. How was the validation or application of the questions carried out? Are the tests applied standardized?</p> <p>Regarding the evaluation of the content validity of the developed worktext, I suggest expanding and improving the report.</p> <p>In Discussion and Conclusion, I consider that more arguments are needed to say that the strategy used contributes to say that it is better because it is not tested with the contribution to performance. The questions from the questionnaires developed for the study have yet to be incorporated.</p> <p>Comments to the authors: I commend the authors for the tremendous amount of work and effort involved in this study, for the time invested in setting up the research preparation and for the diligence with which they set out to evaluate it. The careful consideration of multiple data-points for this evaluation is duly noted.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Andrade Aréchiga
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Colima, México