



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_39075
Title of the Manuscript:	Model for Mathematics Teachers Development
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript focuses on the model for mathematics teachers development that could be of interest to readers but I think that the paper is not suitable in its present form <i>(the literature review is inadequate and the paper covers the topic in a very superficial way; weak discussion and conclusion sections/ What is the researcher's interpretation besides conclusion? Also, it would be helpful to tie the study to the more current and relevant studies (rather than Chickering and Gamson, 1987). Where does this study fit in the literature? What makes this study a unique contribution?)</i> and cannot be considered for publication.	I do not agree with this suggested. Besides, some necessary inclusion of further literature havebeen effected
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Corrections Please make the following corrections: p.1 line 12 – Convert “Teaching methods” into lowercase format. p.1 line 12 – Delete the comma after “learning”. p.1 line 24 – Delete the comma after “that”. Please correct in the rest of the paper. p.2 line 71 – Change “According to Liu & Li” to “According to Liu and Li”. p.4 line 137 – Change “Ball, Hill & Bass” to “Ball, Hill and Bass”. p.4 line 144 – Change “Asiedu-Addo & Yidana” to “Asiedu-Addo and Yidana”. p.4 line 154 – Convert “Teaching” into lowercase format. p.5 line 160 – Convert “knowledge” into uppercase format. p.5 line 161 – Convert “Content Knowledge” into lowercase format. p.5 line 173 – Convert “Mathematics” into lowercase format. p.5 line 179 – Change “Haris, Mishra & Koehler” to “Haris, Mishra and Koehler”. p.5 line 179 – Convert “Pedagogical” into lowercase format. p.6 line 199 – Change “Ball & Bass” to “Ball and Bass”. p.6 line 199 – Convert “Pedagogical” into lowercase format. p.6 line 211 – Change “Mereku & Agbemaka” to “Mereku and Agbemaka” ”. p.6 line 212 – Convert “Curriculum” into lowercase format. p.7 line 230 – Change “Ball & Bass” to “Ball and Bass”.	I do agree with these suggestions. The necessary changes have been made.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript needs more consideration about the following aspects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stronger review of the relevant literature that informs the study. (Gudmundsdottir &amp; Shulman, 1987; Grossman, 1990; Marks, 1990; Ball, Thames, Phelps, 2008; Hill, Schilling &amp; Ball, 2004; Hill, Rowan &amp; Ball, 2005 etc.)</li> <li>• A stronger rationale for the significance of the study.</li> </ul>	I do not agree with the suggestion.