

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94086
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Abilities Needs of Music Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools: A Survey of Graduates from a Normal University in Gui Zhou,China
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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 purpose of the abstract section and the purpose of the literature review section do not match. It should clearly state the purpose of the study.</p> <p><i>“ However, this research also has some shortcomings. First, the sample source is relatively less, and the sample collection is limited to 177 music teachers in primary and secondary schools who graduated from a normal college in Guizhou. Second, the research method is relatively simple. This research merely adopts the 5-point Likert scale questionnaire survey, without in-depth communication and interviews with music teachers in primary and secondary school. It is hoped that the future research can make up for this deficiency.”</i> It is rather pointless to write this section at the end of the study. If he/she thinks there are these deficiencies, then why doesn't he/she fix them? So he/she is not happy with this situation??? Why should we give consent?</p> <p>The last point I would like to add is about the discussion section. He/she kept the discussion very short. Without enough discussion and support with literature, he/she immediately went to the suggestions section. He/she made the suggestion, but then wrote the conclusion again. It's clear that there is a procedural error in sorting. It must first discuss, support and reach a conclusion. It should make the latest recommendations.</p> <p>It is seen that the number of sources for a quantitative study is insufficient.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sermin Agrali Ermis
Department, University & Country	Gazi University, Turkey