

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_95933</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Study on the Association between Socio-demographic Factors and the Six Protective Factors that Foster Resilience among Tanzania Primary Schools Teachers</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> )

### 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 <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	The manuscript is scientifically important for the community of Tanzania. The title is too long. consider summarizing may be to: The association between demographic factors and Resilience among Tanzania's Primary school Teachers. The abstract is good but theres a need to remove repetitions( like second and third sentences) as well as include the method of analysis. The structure of the manuscript is okay but can be made better by including the problem statement and specific objectives. The manuscript is scientifically correct but has to define how resilience was measured in the regression model. References are sufficient and correct	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of English language suits scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There cannot be only six factors fostering Resilience. The author should consider removing this restriction. Full results of the regression should be given since it gives a better picture	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Victoria Kakooza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kyambogo University, Uganda</b>