

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJESS_95556</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Perception of Teachers and Principals on Professional Development Needs, Types, Impacts, and challenges: A case study under Trashigang Dzongkhag.</b> |
| 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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br/><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The manuscript has essential contents that can contribute to the scientific community.</li> <li>2) The title of the study is appropriate and acceptable</li> <li>3) The abstract is comprehensive however; it needs to be trimmed down to 250 words. The authors should simply highlight the most basic context of the manuscript. For instance, the purpose and objectives that were written in the beginning of the abstract should have been combined into one statement since they express the same thought.</li> <li>4) Some of the subsections have some concerns and needs to be revised accordingly. For instance, The Primary Questions and the Objectives of the Study in the Introduction part should have been combined together and form the research objectives.</li> <li>5) I believe the manuscript has been done in a methodological manner and yes, it is scientifically accurate.</li> <li>6) The references are enough, however, some of them are already obsolete (or old) please update some of them. (Please see general comments below for further suggestions)</li> </ol>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The language used in the manuscript is acceptable and within the standards of communicating with the scholarly community. Minor proofreading by a professional or a software may accomplish this task.</li> </ol>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | <p>Here are some more suggestions in order to improve the whole manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Abstract. Combine The purpose and objective of the study into one since it only pertains to the same thing. Organize the methodology into the following: Research Design, Sample of the study, Instrument, Data Analysis, Major Findings, Conclusion, and Recommendation. Bear in mind that the authors should all do this in 250 words or less.</li> <li>2) The abbreviations should be spelled out in the study not in the first part of the study.</li> <li>3) Introduction. Please revise some old literature in the introduction. Consider using recent ones who has been published 2013 and above. Also, start your discussion in a global scale down to your local perspective with regards to your topic to emphasize the comparison and to strengthen the argument of your study. Here are some related literature that might help you and for possible inclusion in your introduction and review of related literature (just click the DOI/ URL): 1) <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.33902/jpr.v3i3.124">http://dx.doi.org/10.33902/jpr.v3i3.124</a> ; 2) <a href="https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3624812">https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3624812</a> ;</li> <li>4) should be explicitly mentioned in the discussion first and try to connect the concept with the current study that the authors are working with right now. There is no need to elaborate what is research design since majority of the readers already know what is a research design. For the Population and Sampling, what are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study? What sampling technique was used? When did this study happened? How long was the data gathering process? There should be a discussion for the Instrument as well which is a separate subsection of the methodology section. Include whether it is researcher-made or adopted as well as the validity of it. As for the data analysis, did the authors used a software (e.g. NVIVO) for the analysis?</li> <li>5) Findings. Instead of writing down how many participants were enjoined in a particular subtheme, the authors should have made a table which includes the frequency of the participants in each identified themes/ subthemes (please see the work: <a href="https://doi.org/10.33902/IJODS.2021169729">https://doi.org/10.33902/IJODS.2021169729</a> for basis).</li> <li>6) Conclusion. Please align this section with the objectives/ research questions of the study.</li> <li>7) Finally, provide an Implication section based on the findings of the study.</li> </ol> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>John Mark R. Asio</b>           |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Gordon College, Philippines</b> |