

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_96937</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>School Internal Factors and Teacher Effectiveness in Secondary Schools in Lira District, Uganda.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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>	1. The manuscript is very important to the scientific community.  2. The title of the article is appropriate.  3. A comprehensive summary of the research procedures should be provided rather than broken down into specific elements.  4. Introduction to the research is brief, preferably enriched. - It did not explain what the internal factors of the school were and did not explain in depth as it should. -The method of rationing the study tools was not sufficiently explained. - It is preferable to enrich the interpretation of the results. 5. The manuscript is correct, but it needs to be enriched and deepened 6. Enriching the research needs more recent references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	- It is recommended that the manuscript be reviewed by a proofreader.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	- It is better to clarify the concept of internal factors of the school.	

### 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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zohra Lassoued</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of El Oued, Algeria</b>