

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_98704 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Digital Literary, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Research Skill: A Structural Equation Model in Professional Competence of Teachers |
| Type of the 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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) | 1. Manuscript important for the scientific community since the research about pedagogical approaches has been given a scientific touch/perspective. -It is relevant in the current pedagogical revolution at the global stage due to diverse needs of the learner and also due to the changing dynamic environment enabled by technological advancements. 2-The title is suitable.However, the term "pedagogical" is wrongly spelt.Quite glaring 3.Yes the abstract is comprehensive though results of the findings should have been expounded further. 4.The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.However, the specific objectives(1.1) should have been summarized not to look voluminous and bulky for any pedestrian reader. 5.The manuscript is scientifically correct since scientific approaches have been adopted in creating this article. 6.References are ok as long as there is no ghost referencing Additional comments. There should be joint results for the combined outcomes of all the independent variables against the dependent variable | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Langugae in use is suitable for scholarly communication | |
| Optional/General comments | Author should address editorials | |

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: | Allan Kihara |
| Department, University & Country | USIU, Kenya |