

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Basic and Applied Research international</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBARI_12717
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study on the Degree of Pre-service Teachers' Cognition of the Causes and Solutions of "Understand Immediately When Hearing, but Fail Immediately When Doing"</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in mathematics education – students' inability to apply knowledge despite understanding concepts in class. By focusing on pre-service mathematics teachers' cognition, it highlights an underexplored area in educational research, shedding light on potential gaps in teacher training and pedagogical approaches. The findings emphasize the need for reflective teaching practices, offering	

	actionable insights to enhance both teaching and learning processes in mathematics education. Against this background, I adjudge the manuscript as important to the scientific community.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is clear but slightly verbose. A more concise and engaging alternative could be: <b>"Pre-Service Mathematics Teachers' Perceptions of the 'Understand but Fail to Apply' Phenomenon in Middle School Education"</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but could be streamlined for clarity. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlight the research problem more succinctly.</li> <li>• Add a sentence on the significance of the findings.</li> <li>• Consider removing less critical details about methodology to focus on results and implications.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate. The methodology (interview-based survey) aligns with the research questions, and the analysis is appropriate for the sample size. However, the small and homogeneous sample limits generalizability.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References are sufficient and recent. They include relevant literature from 1996 to 2024.</li> <li>• To strengthen the study, consider incorporating additional references on reflective teaching practices and cognition in teacher training, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Schön, D. A. (1983). <b>"The Reflective Practitioner."</b></li> <li>○ Biggs, J. (1996). <b>"Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment."</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Although the first work is older than all the works cited but it is a good resources that will add more to this manuscript.</p>	

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript's language is suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from minor improvements to enhance fluency and readability. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace "students did not have a profound understanding" with "students lacked a deep understanding."</li> <li>• Avoid repetitive phrases, e.g., "understanding immediately when hearing but failing immediately when doing."</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript effectively addresses an important educational challenge but could better contextualize its findings within broader educational theory.</li> <li>• Suggestions for teacher training are valuable but should be expanded with practical examples or programs that address the identified gaps.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i></p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Kevin C. Anaeache</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Godfrey Okoye University, Nigeria</b></p>