

## Result of Review

**Title:** Analyzing the Teaching and Learning of Mathematical Reasoning Skills in Secondary School

**Author(s):** E. Elvis Napitupulu

### Decision of Paper Selection

- A. Accept submission, no revisions required.
- B. Accept submission, revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments.
- C. Major revision; you may revise and resubmit for review.
- D. Decline submission.

### What should you do next? (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable).
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication; please inform us of agreement by e-mail.
- ✓ Pay a publication fee of 400.00USD for the paper.
  - ✧ Please find payment information at: <http://payment.ccsenet.org>
  - ✧ Please notify the editorial assistant when payment has been made

### Proposed Schedule for Publication (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ Vol. 14, No. 1, January 2018, if you meet above requirements within 2 weeks.
- ✓ e-Version First: the online version may be published soon after the final draft is completed.
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

### Additional Information (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ You will receive two copies (per paper) of the printed journal, *free of charge*
- ✓ If you want to buy more printed journals, please contact the editorial assistant
- ✓ You may download the e-journal in PDF free of charge at: <http://ass.ccsenet.org>
- ✓ Other questions please contact the editorial assistant at: [ass@ccsenet.org](mailto:ass@ccsenet.org)

## Comments from Editor

Evaluation	Grade
	Please give a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1(high to low)
<b>Overall evaluation of the paper</b>	<b>3</b>
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and readability	3
Soundness of methodology	3
Evidence supports conclusion	3
Adequacy of literature review	3
<b>Comments and Suggestions</b>	
<p>(*) <i>Revise the paper according to Paper Submission Guide: <a href="http://www.ccsenet.org/submission">www.ccsenet.org/submission</a></i></p> <p>( ) Picture(s)/figure(s) are not clear; 300 dpi is required.</p> <p>( ) Move the footnotes to endnotes.</p> <p>( ) Resize the table(s)/figure(s), to fit A4 paper size, and make all the pages be vertical.</p> <p>( ) Revise table(s) into three-line table(s).</p> <p>( ) Insert table(s) and figure(s) into the text, not after references.</p> <p>( ) Similarity index (checked by iThenticate) is high, please find the iThenticate report attached, revise to keep the Similarity Index <math>\leq 30\%</math> and single source matches are not <math>&gt;6\%</math>.</p> <p>(*) <i>Add DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs, please see Paper Submission Guide.</i></p> <p>(*) <i>Others:</i></p> <p><i>Please send the revised paper via the email <a href="mailto:ass@ccsenet.org">ass@ccsenet.org</a> directly.</i></p>	

Note: revise your paper according to the items with “(\*)”

## Comments from Reviewer A

❖ <b>Evaluation</b> (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent    4=Good    3=Average    2=Below Average    1=Poor	
<b>Items</b>	<b>Grade</b>
Contribution to existing knowledge	2
Organization and Readability	2
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	3
❖ <b>Strengths</b>	
This work shows the effort of the author(s), trying to develop a set of MRS teaching/learning materials used by the upper secondary students. The author(s) successfully introduce a preliminary framework of designing a MRS model.	
❖ <b>Weaknesses</b>	
However, the manuscript, as I read, is more like part of a project report than a completed innovation or review article.	
❖ <b>Suggestions to Author/s</b>	
1. There are quite a few grammatical errors shown in the content, e.g., “which <u>applying...</u> ” at the starting of the fifth line in Abstract. The author(s) should double-check carefully the manuscript’s English content.	
2. The Introduction is apparently too tedious on describing the theories employed in the study, and instead turns hard to catch the main points of the study’s purpose. I suggest it can be briefed by eliminating at least one half in length concisely.	
3. Regarding the pre- and post-test adopted in the research, I suggest the author(s) figure out more detailed reasons to explain the discrepancies on the students’ performance between the Pre/Post Performance as in Table 4.	
4. Conclusion should include more analyses and discussions on the results.	