

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_102768
Title of the Manuscript:	INCENTIVISED SCHOOL CLIMATE AND TEACHERS' PRODUCTIVITY IN MISSION SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA.
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>It is my pleasure while reviewing this article entitled "<i>Incentivised School Climate And Teachers' Productivity In Mission Secondary Schools In Delta State, Nigeria.</i>" I have the following concerns on the article.</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes, but, better if result is elaborated more</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? Yes, but, Better if added more.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>1. The conclusion is general, better if recommended based on the result.</p> <p>2. Better to check grammar.</p> <p>3. The discussion section part is too shallow, better if discussed based on your research objectives.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Better if edited.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Stated above	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elias Ezo
Department, University & Country	Wachemo University, Ethiopia