

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_100772
Title of the Manuscript:	Teachers' level of Motivation and 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. <i>The manuscript is important for the scientific community considering the world is shifting drastic transition from traditional to scientific challenges.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The title of the article is suitable as stated.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The abstract of the article is comprehensive but very lengthy and suggested to shorten only as per standard.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Subsections are well defined as to its technicalities.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Article is scientifically correct.</i></p> <p>6. <i>References are good enough to support the paper.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. <i>Recommendation for grammar review by an english grammar expert.</i></p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. <i>Abstract is very lengthy; it is therefore suggested to limit only by observing the required number of words. SHORT BUT SUBSTANTIAL</i></p> <p>2. <i>The introduction is in order but very long. I would suggest that introduction must only deal with the special features of the research paper, felt needs of the study and as much as possible, statement of the importance of the study although with separate item.</i></p> <p>3. <i>In the introduction, I would suggest that issuances, DepEd Orders/ Memoranda/ studies be limited only, instead, include these to the review of literature or studies.</i></p> <p>4. <i>Additional recommendation that can be conducted to further enhance the level of motivation and level of satisfaction of the teachers and other personnel.</i></p> <p>5. <i>In the recommendation presented, it was emphasised that capacity building and other trainings like financial literacy be conducted, it would be better in the full paper, action plan be made to ensure that findings of the study be properly addressed and given extra attention. Doing so, this action addresses towards the enhancement of the level of motivation and level of satisfaction of the target subjects.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Proposed action plan be crafted with complete staff works for capacity building as an output.</i></p> <p>***In summary, the paper is in order but still needs for further enhancement to meet the desired targets or objectives/ aims of the study.</p>	

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:	Amado a. Oliva, JR.
Department, University & Country	College of Arts and Sciences, Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges, Philippines