

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_97432
Title of the Manuscript:	SCHOOLS PREPAREDNESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETENCY BASED CURRICULUM
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)
<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 manuscript is important and relevant for scientific community -The relevance of CBC is quite critical in today's learning environment since it aims to just not focus on knowledge but acquisition of other lifelong skills. -CBC programme is a shift from the colonial models applied since it demands a shift from the old models which emphasized more of cognitive ability which is not enough based on experiences from those who have gone through it.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable though it should have captured the industry or sector and even the geographical scope and the country where the research was conducted.</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive since it should have captured all the summaries from all the chapters</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscripts are not adequate in presentation of what needs to be captured. Was there a methodology adopted? Were there findings of the paper?</p> <p>5. It is not scientifically correct since it misses out on the scientific component of research...ie Theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, data collection and analysis and conclusions</p> <p>6. The references are alright though not all in APA. Of interest is much of the in-text discussions have not acknowledged the sources and thus inadequate in confirming ownership of work..</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language is ok in quality for scholarly communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Missing information needs to be added.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Allan Kihara
Department, University & Country	USIU-Africa, Kenya