

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_93344
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROPOLITICS IN THE WORKPLACE AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, AND INSIGHTS
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.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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references at the end of the manuscript are not numbered. Many articles listed at the reference section are not referred in the text. Many studies referenced within the text are not included in the reference list at the end of the manuscript. There are spelling and syntax errors. They are highlighted in the edited manuscript. The author should correct them and try to improve the overall English used. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript exceeds the proposed length of 3000-6000 words, since it consists of more than 9900 words. Maybe non-english text could be removed or some parts of the text can be re-written in a brief form. 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript deals with an interesting subject of education. The literature review, the method section and the result and discussion sections are thoroughly presented and explained. The author should take care of the references (see previous comment) and try to improve the language used. The editor should advice if the manuscript is too long for publishing (more than 9900 words). I propose major revision in order to be accepted.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Athanasios Bassounas
Department, University & Country	University of Ioannina, Greece