

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95810
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS INFLUENCING PUPIL TRANSITION FROM PRIMARY TO SECONDARY SCHOOL IN HULUGHO SUB-COUNTY, KENYA.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This article addresses the importance of future planning and to improve the needs of pupils transitioning from one level of education to the next.</p> <p>2. I would recommend clarity and include "From the lens of educational leaders." When reading the title initially, I would have guessed that the data collection included pupils rather than educational people.</p> <p>3. I found the abstract weak. The abstract was difficult to read due to grammar issues, lengthy sentences and different tenses used in the abstract. For example, the last sentence is long, consider two separate sentences.</p> <p>4. Subsections are adequate, a recommendation I would make is to include some background information on Kenya. What is the proportion of various age groups of youth. What is the geographical area like? Is there any connection with factors to influence this research? I did not see any mention of ethical considerations, consent, rigour, significance of the study?</p> <p>5. It is difficult to identify if there is any bias as the writer may be an educator or have a connection with the respondents? How were the respondents recruited and why were these particular respondents chosen?</p> <p>6. For the majority of references, they are current. Updating older references would be important to strengthen the overall work of the author(s).</p> <p>Overall, a well written article, consider the recommendations for improvement. The headings and content are inclusive of detail and need minor attention to grammar and tense.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The content in the article is well written. The abstract needs some additional word-smithing.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>I would suggest including a separate section on ethical considerations. For example, was ethical approval received from the institution? How was consent obtained, how did you ensure rigour was obtained? How did you ensure members remained anonymous/were they? Can other members in the institution identify members based on the findings?</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sherry Arvidson</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Regina, Canada</b>