

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98953
Title of the Manuscript:	The Study of Professional Competencies of Faculties in RUB Colleges: Students' Perspective
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>In the abstract, please remove the following, as it is neither noteworthy nor applicable: "Thirdly, it was determined that the acclaimed author's competency was a skill that faculties at various colleges of the Royal University of Bhutan needed to improve." Sounds narcissistic and shameless self-promotion. Did others have this competence? If so, how many? Why not list each one?</p> <p>You must change the conclusion. Instead of worshipping and promoting the author, list the competencies which are excellent and list the ones which are weak. Describe how you conducted the pilot study.</p> <p>Reliability analysis: Were any in the pilot study in the final study? How were the values in Table 3 selected? Was there anonymity and confidentiality? How was the survey administered?</p> <p>The sample for the acclaimed author by each school/college must be exceptionally small. How was the sample picked? As in one sees stratification, but how were students in each college picked? Abstract states 362 in the sample, but then this number is never mentioned again. 362 is an underpowered sample, as the minimum computer number was 384. Still, 94.2% completion is exception. The study should have included 20-30% more than the minimum to ensure meeting minimal requirements, though some individual colleges might be skewed. Please show 362 in the article.</p> <p>Were there any negatives? Recommendations lack concrete ideas tied to the literature. A lot of questions, but with the sample size, factor analysis could have been used to improve the study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA