

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_90956
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE PERCEPTION OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING OF AGRICULTURE IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN GHANA
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:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This manuscript reports about an interesting issue. It is well organized. Importance of the problem is stated based upon a bibliographical review, a theoretical framework to study effectiveness of teaching is assumed, a methodological design is chosen, instruments are appropriate and analysis of data is correct. However, there is a mistake that must be solved. Since inquiry is based upon students' perceptions, and there are no other evidences (for example, classroom observations, perception of teachers or other members of the staff, data about learning achievements) conclusions must be reformulated in a way that this issue is made clear. I suggest proposing this study as preliminary and state conclusions as findings that must be corroborated or not by means of other inquiries.	
Minor REVISION comments	Apparently, questionnaires used were constructed by authors. If this is the case, it increases the value of the research, and it would be interesting to add some commentaries that explain the process of construction and complement the very good description about how they were tested.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eduardo Mario Lacues Apud
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Uruguay, Uruguay