

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98481
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence factors of school leadership practices: Perspectives of senior high school teachers in the Tano North District
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic is interesting and the knowledge about leadership is very important especially when it relate with school leaders. So, the manuscript will contribute significantly to the community</p> <p>2. The title can be improved, my suggestion: The factors that influence the school leadership practices: Perspectives of Senior High School Teachers in the Tano North District.</p> <p>3. Abstract should be written in one paragraph only. First sentence should highlight the issue before state the aim or objective of this study. Make re-arrange the content properly. For example, mention type of research (qualitative or quantitative) when you discuss about methodology, and the result under subtopic of finding and suggestion not conclusion.</p> <p>4. Structure quite ok. The discussion should not blend together with data or result analysis. My suggestion creates a discussion sub-topic to discuss the finding properly.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is not scientifically done correctly, especially for Problem Statement, Methodology and Findings. In Problem Statement, there is no problem has been stated properly. It should begin with "therefore, the purpose of this study..... For research methodology, the researcher should mention type of research and research design; and everything should follow the design (descriptive). However, in paragraph two the researcher mention about "open ended questionnaire" which usually relate with qualitative research. Data analysis mention the researcher use frequency, percentage and descriptive but when I examine the finding/ result, the researcher applied frequency and percentage only. Moreover, I think the result is not properly analysed. It looks like just based on one question. Normally quantitative instrument will develop a few items to measure one specific variable not only one question. Decision based on only one question will be a lot of bias issue to the researcher self-interest.</p> <p>6. References: sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think need for proof read and check for grammar. I found quit a lot grammar mistake	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

	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:	Rohana Binti Hamzah
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia