

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	<p>The investigated problem is of interest. The authors' intention to analyze an educational field with a strong practical component is useful.</p> <p>There are some weaknesses that need to be addressed.</p> <p>The authors do not present in the paper the time interval in which the data collection took place and which is relevant for the presentation of the proportion of men and women.</p> <p>The authors do not specify the objectives of their research, to then correlate them with the results obtained and then correlate them with the analysis performed.</p> <p>In the research, the authors do not present its limitations or if there are no limitations. If there are no research limitations, it must be explained why they are not.</p> <p>It is not well explained whether the research results are strictly applicable to the field of agricultural education or whether it can be extended to other similar fields.</p> <p>The recommendations proposed by the authors are heterogeneous and insufficiently correlated with the research conclusions. Isn't education a creative activity, where teachers are best in their relationship with students? Isn't the imposition from the last recommendation exaggerated?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the bibliographic references, the authors entered a position twice, which cannot be accessed either (Macatta, M. (2016). Importance of agricultural sector in a county's economic development. http://www.ippmedia.com/en/features/importance-agricultural-sector-country's-economic-development.htm). This situation creates suspicions about the use of bibliographic references and needs to be corrected.</p>	
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:	Lucian Lupu-Dima
Department, University & Country	University of Petrosani, Romania