

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_96527
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Principals' transformational Leadership practices and teachers' job satisfaction
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>1. The topic of this article is interesting and will be very useful for many people, especially policy makers in the field of Education.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is. The abstract has fulfilled the requirements of a scientific article.</p> <p>4. Yes, but the section 2.1 Purpose of the Study must be revisited. The author(s) did not clearly state the purpose of the study.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. Regarding the recent references, 50% of the references are published after 2017. However, one reference, Ekaningsih, A.S. must be revised as it did not meet the bibliographical style.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is. The language used is clear.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the Discussion section, I could not find any findings of the current study that differ from or against previous studies. Did the author(s) only referred to the previous studies that support them? If yes, they must also state their findings that contradict/did not support the previous studies. Therefore, the findings are honest and give more benefits to any future studies.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahmat Budiman
Department, University & Country	Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia