

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98048
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relationship between Teacher's Motivation and their Job Satisfaction in Secondary Schools in Onitsha Education Zone, Anambra State, Nigeria
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The paper is not very new but it is still important in the scientific community.</p> <p>Instead of relationship in the title, it could also be the impact of teachers' motivation on job satisfaction</p> <p>The abstract could be unified in such a way that the the chronology of the ff. is seamless: intro (what prompted the researchers to undertake the study, the main goals/objectives, the methodology to attain the objectives and the results and discussion.</p> <p>It is best if not only correlation questions were raised. Qualitative assessment should have been done to triangulate results.</p> <p>Several literatures are old and even the adopted tools such as the WTMST and MSQ. Consider studies over the last five years.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but it is strongly recommended to frame sentences in varied ways so as discussions will not become monotonous. Have the paper undergo stylistics and editing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	Dennis g. Caballes
Department, University & Country	The National Teachers College, Philippines