

# Review of: "Assessing students' attitudes and perceptions towards statistical literacy in a university system in a developing African country"

Ebrahim Mohammadpour

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to review your paper titled: Assessing students' attitudes and perceptions towards statistical literacy in a university system in a developing African country. Although the title sounds appealing and captivating, there are numerous important factors that need to be carefully considered.

## 1. Introduction and literature review:

- The background literature has not undergone a comprehensive review to establish a connection between existing theoretical and practical knowledge, as well as to explore new aspects that require investigation.

## 1. Method:

- The paper lacks proper structure as all the explanations related to this section should be consolidated together. For instance, all the information about the sample should only be included in this part. However, in the current format, the sample statistics are repeated in the results section.

## 1. Results:

- The Result Section (3.1) is not relevant in this context and should be included in the Method Section or presented in a Table for better clarity. Additionally, when considering the age variable in the first and second groups (17-21 and 21-25), it is unclear which group an individual aged 21 would belong to.
- The respondents' education level was analyzed and it was found that the majority (n=40; 22%) were in level two during the first semester or 2.1, while 19% (n=35) were in level 1.2. Additionally, at least 17% (n=33) of the students were in level 2.2. However, the exact definition of level two may not be clear to international readers.
- It is conventional to organize the results and discussion segments into different sections, clearly marked with headings like "results" and "discussion".
- In its current format, the exploratory analysis is conducted section by section, leading to redundant repetition of information like alpha, KMO, etc. measures in the results part.
- Moreover, I was unable to observe the instrument itself, a crucial element for our evaluation.

In its current form, I do not suggest this paper for publication in the journal.

