



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_65389
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHERS BELIEFS, INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES AND STUDENTS' MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE
Type of the Article	

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>)

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>How were scores of constructivist beliefs and instructional practices obtained? Were arithmetic means of the responses of the items or weighted means?</p> <p>Were the score ranges for beliefs and practices defined in the original studies or were they defined by the authors of the present study?</p> <p>When adjusting the regression models, the authors used the original values or categories in the tables on pages 5, 6 and 7?</p> <p>I would like to know if the use of hierarchical models (Raudenbush and Bryk) has been assessed, since the population of interest has this structure.</p> <p>Did the authors assess other student variables? For example, the gender and socio-economic level of students are also predictors of performance in mathematics, these variables could be used as control in the models. It is possible that the relationships found in the study can be explained by these variables, and not by the constructs evaluated.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Footnotes are empty and references are not identified in the manuscript. It was not possible to verify which study was being mentioned at each point in the text.</p> <p>In the results and discussion section, some authors are mentioned, but references are not included (Piaget, Lave, Thompson). They are well-known authors, but I believe it is necessary to indicate references for unfamiliar readers.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Luís Gustavo do Amaral Vinha</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Brasília, Brazil</i>