

8:43

4G 73



[MTRJ] Editor Decision Kotak Masuk



Rully Indra

ke saya, swjdkhsari, adiwibawa, Mal...

2/10/2021 [Tampilkan detailnya](#)



Dear I Putu Ade Andre Payadnya, I Ketut Suwija, and Kadek Adi Wibawa,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled Investigation of Students' Abilities in Solving Realistic Mathematics Problems Using "What-If"-Ethnomathematics Instruments has been ACCEPTED with MAJOR REVISION. This article will be published in the Mathematics Teaching-Research Journal (MTRJ) for Special Issue Vol 13 N 3, Indonesian Researcher perspective in Teaching Mathematics, after suitable revision and to fulfill the MTRJ's standard.

Congratulations!

Authors are encouraged to carefully consider the reviewers' comments and suggestions for improvement of their





Congratulations!

Authors are encouraged to carefully consider the reviewers' comments and suggestions for improvement of their manuscript. Here are reviewers' comments:

Reviewer A:

The paper is about using topics rooted in students' cultures to teach math concepts. As the author claims, students had difficulties with such problems due to various reasons. Some due to insufficient knowledge of the ethnic items and some due to insufficient math skills.

Overall it is an interesting paper with lots of merits but requires major revisions. The biggest issue I see is that the author is writing the paper from the attitude of what the students should know and do, instead of analyzing how to alter their own teaching style to improve students' learning.

There are some suggestions for the author to improve the quality of the submission:

Page 1: The author should clearly state at the beginning of the paper what is meant by "realistic problems"





Page 1, Introduction: The first sentence seems awkward in English. Should it be "Mathematics is an important subject in the development of an education of a student"?

While introducing the competencies either define them or skip that part.

The section Introduction should contain,

1. Author's motivation for writing the paper.
2. A brief statement who wrote about similar topics.
3. Questions posed by the author and what methods are used to tackle them. This includes data collection and analysis.

Other things can be removed from the introduction.

The analysis of students' errors is suitable for the paper in MTRJ but when writing conclusions the author should clearly state how to change the lesson to improve students learning.

Reviewer B:

The topic is interesting, but the article needs to be revised almost in foundations.

1. As the descriptions imply, it seems to





Reviewer B:

The topic is interesting, but the article needs to be revised almost in foundations.

1. As the descriptions imply, it seems to be mixed methods. It should be described.
2. The classification should be described exactly and with examples.
3. The article contents a lot of mistakes in formulations and spelling. There should be looked for. The writing style might become more scientific.
4. Some places like p 2, above (Freudenthal), are missing a hint in literature. It should be complemented.
5. At the bottom of p 2: Are there results? It is too early to write them down here. Otherwise, there should be regarded.
6. Down on p 2, "Ethnomathematics or ethnomathematics" is the same.
7. "Research Design" begins twice. The last sentence there mentions the most important points of the study and should be described exactly.
8. The article contents a lot of definitions like "unstructured interview" a. s. o. The reader should know it, so they do not need





8. The article contents a lot of definitions like "unstructured interview" a. s. o. The reader should know it, so they do not need to be described inside the article.

9. Some parts of the discussions seem to belong to results, not to the discussion.

10. The first sentences in the discussions describe methods and should be much earlier.

11. At the bottom of p 8 one finds a question. Questions and their meanings belong to the design of the study.

12. The points 1 to 4 on p 14f seem to contain theory, not results of the study. No connections to own results are described. Otherwise, it should be supplemented.

13. References should be in APA-style. Please, look for it.

For more details, please check the reviewers' comments in the attached email. Furthermore, the author must make sure all references follow this guideline to ensure that your final file is complete and in the correct format for preparing their paper strictly by using our journal template. You can also follow the article

that has already been published in MTD I



8:43

4G 73



For more details, please check the reviewers' comments in the attached email. Furthermore, the author must make sure all references follow this guideline to ensure that your final file is complete and in the correct format for preparing their paper strictly by using our journal template. You can also follow the article that has already been published in MTRJ.

Please submit the final revised paper along with the recapitulation of the contents of the revised article and the similarity check result file (no more than 25%) to the email: [rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id](mailto:rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id) and [bronisuavec2@gmail.com](mailto:bronisuavec2@gmail.com). Authors should submit the revised manuscript by October 20, 2021; if you anticipate that you will be unable to meet this deadline, please notify us. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you very much for your cooperation, and have a great day.

Kind regards,

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rully Charitas Indra



Payadnyda et al.

The topic is interesting, but the article needs to be revised almost in foundations.

1. As the descriptions imply, it seems to be mixed methods. It should be described.
2. The classification should be described exacter and with examples.
3. The article contents a lot of mistakes in formulations and spelling. There should be looked for. The writing style might become more scientific.
4. Some places like p 2, above (Freudenthal), are missing a hint in literature. It should be complemented.
5. At the bottom of p 2: Are there results? It is too early to write them down here. Otherwise, there should be a regard.
6. Down on p 2, "Ethnomathematics or ethnomathematics" is the same.
7. "Research Design" begins twice. The last sentence there mentions most important points of the study and should be describes exacter.
8. The article contents a lot of definitions like "unstructured interview" a. s. o. The reader should know it, so they do not need to be described inside the article.
9. Some parts of the discussions seem to belong to results, not to discussion.
10. The first sentences in the discussions describe methods and should be much earlier.
11. At the bottom of p 8 one finds a question. Questions and their meanings belong to the design of the study.
12. The points 1 to 4 on p 14f seem to contain theory, not results of the study. No connections to own results are described. Otherwise, it should be supplemented.
13. References should be in APA-style. Please, look for it.

Dear I Putu Ade Andre Payadnya, I Ketut Suwija, and Kadek Adi Wibawa,

It is my great pleasure to inform you that your paper entitled Investigation of Students' Abilities in Solving Realistic Mathematics Problems Using "What-If"-Ethnomathematics Instruments has been ACCEPTED with MAJOR REVISION. This article will be published in the Mathematics Teaching-Research Journal (MTRJ) for Special Issue Vol 13 N 3, Indonesian Researcher perspective in Teaching Mathematics, after suitable revision and to fulfill the MTRJ's standard.

Congratulations!

Authors are encouraged to carefully consider the reviewers' comments and suggestions for improvement of their manuscript. Here are reviewers' comments:

Reviewer A:

The paper is about using topics rooted in students' cultures to teach math concepts. As the author claims, students had difficulties with such problems due to various reasons. Some due to insufficient knowledge of the ethnic items and some due to insufficient math skills.

Overall it is an interesting paper with lots of merits but requires major revisions. The biggest issue I see is that the author is writing the paper from the attitude of what the students should know and do, instead of analyzing how to alter their own teaching style to improve students' learning.

There are some suggestions for the author to improve the quality of the submission:

Page 1: The author should clearly state at the beginning of the paper what is meant by "realistic problems"

Page 1, Introduction: The first sentence seems awkward in English. Should it be "Mathematics is an important subject in the development of an education of a student"?

While introducing the competencies either define them or skip that part.

The section Introduction should contain,

1. Author's motivation for writing the paper.
2. A brief statement who wrote about similar topics.
3. Questions posed by the author and what methods are used to tackle them. This includes data collection and analysis.

Other things can be removed from the introduction.

The analysis of students' errors is suitable for the paper in MTRJ but when writing conclusions the author should clearly state how to change the lesson to improve students learning.

Reviewer B:

The topic is interesting, but the article needs to be revised almost in foundations.

1. As the descriptions imply, it seems to be mixed methods. It should be described.
2. The classification should be described exactly and with examples.
3. The article contents a lot of mistakes in formulations and spelling. There should be looked for. The writing style might become more scientific.
4. Some places like p 2, above (Freudenthal), are missing a hint in literature. It should be complemented.
5. At the bottom of p 2: Are there results? It is too early to write them down here. Otherwise, there should be regarded.
6. Down on p 2, "Ethnomathematics or ethnomathematics" is the same.
7. "Research Design" begins twice. The last sentence there mentions the most important points of the study and should be described exactly.
8. The article contents a lot of definitions like "unstructured interview" a. s. o. The reader should know it, so they do not need to be described inside the article.
9. Some parts of the discussions seem to belong to results, not to the discussion.
10. The first sentences in the discussions describe methods and should be much earlier.
11. At the bottom of p 8 one finds a question. Questions and their meanings belong to the design of the study.
12. The points 1 to 4 on p 14f seem to contain theory, not results of the study. No connections to own results are described. Otherwise, it should be supplemented.
13. References should be in APA-style. Please, look for it.

For more details, please check the reviewers' comments in the attached email. Furthermore, the author must make sure all references follow this guideline to ensure that your final file is complete and in the correct format for preparing their paper strictly by using our journal template. You can also follow the article that has already been published in MTRJ.

Please submit the final revised paper along with the recapitulation of the contents of the revised article and the similarity check result file (no more than 25%) to the email: [rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id](mailto:rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id) and [bronisuavec2@gmail.com](mailto:bronisuavec2@gmail.com). Authors should submit the revised manuscript by October 20, 2021; if you anticipate that you will be unable to meet this deadline, please notify us. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you very much for your cooperation, and have a great day.

Kind regards,

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana, S.Si., M.Pd.

Southeast Asian Editor of Mathematics Teaching-Research Journal for Indonesian Section

8:43

4G 72



Ade Andre Unmas

ke Rully, bronisuavec2

6/10/2021 [Tampilkan detailnya](#)



Dear Dr. Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana,

Here we attach my final revised paper along with similarity and grammar check results.

We also made a little change to the title of my paper, from "Investigation" to "Analysis" as the reviewer suggested to make it more appropriate with the content of my paper.

Best regards,

I Putu Ade Andre Payadnya

---

Mathematics Education Lecturer  
Mathematics Education Study Program | Faculty of Teacher  
Training and Education  
Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar  
Jalan Kamboja, No. 11A, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia  
Phone: 082146540681, (0361) 462715 (Office)

[Tampilkan kutipan teks](#)



Article I Put...sed 1).docx

