

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_98865
Title of the Manuscript:	Roles of School Counsellors as Career Developers and Learning motivators in Nigerian Secondary Schools
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	We consider this research to be important for the scientific community because it raises the problem of the youths that will soon step on the career path. We do not see any necessity to change the title. The abstract is comprehensive The reviewer has made some corrections and improvements in the structure of subsections. We do believe that the manuscript may sound a few folds better if the author revise and rewrite the conclusion which, honestly speaking, involves repetition of the same ideas in the first and second paragraphs of the Conclusion. The references are satisfactory. However, we are not satisfied with recommendations where the author was going to include 4 options (the digits are four), but there are only three options.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality, in general, is good, though we discovered a kind of dislike towards plural. There are some typos as well as punctuation errors that have been noticed and corrected by the reviewer.	
Optional/General comments	We recommend the author to have a thorough look again, improve the conclusive part and accept the errors corrected. The corrections were made in REVIEW Mode, so that they can be seen and accepted instantly.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamo Chilingaryan
Department, University & Country	RUDN University, Russia