

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98150
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Perception of Distributive Fairness on Performance Appraisal practices in Public Secondary Schools in Cherangany Sub-County
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as the teachers must know about distributive fairness of PA practices and its influence also. The PA should be purposeful.</p> <p>Title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Its fine but need to relate two aspects in meaningful way.</p> <p>It's okay.</p> <p>It can be taken as correct.</p> <p>In text the references are double as compared to reference list. There is major problem in reference list. References are not recent (till 2017).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is fine.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Additional comment</p> <p>Aims in abstract are not clearly defined.</p> <p>Page 1: To change the negative perceptions from the teachers, the study recommends use of a combination of methods in collection of performance appraisal data such as peer observation, self-evaluation, 360-degree assessment, verbal discussions and external assessment. The teachers should however be involved in selecting of the preferred appraisal methods. – There is no base for this conclusion?</p> <p>Why interviews of Principals are taken when not used in study. Moreover, spelling of females and principals.</p> <p>There are extra commas in key words.</p> <p>Page 4: The sample size was drawn from 468 respondents comprising of 71 principals and 468 teachers from 71 public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County – This is not matching with information in Abstract.</p> <p>Page 5: based on study objectives. - the main paper is without – objective of study. Each table must be against one objective.</p> <p>3.1 Teacher Performance Appraisal Practices – It's not so rather it is perception of Teachers' about the influence of PA practices.</p> <p>In Table 1 in columns add % sigh beside F.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Page 6 and ahead: Disagree and strongly disagree can be combined and written as negative and vice-versa positive and rest neutral.</p> <p>Page 7: Table 1 and 2 should look alike.</p> <p>Page 8: The POYA, TOYA & iTOYA reward schemes in my school and region are fairly distributed. - In Above line need to add 'based on PA'</p> <p>Page 9: In correlation variables are not highlighted.</p> <p>Page 10: Conclusion is not appropriate. Concluding lines should have base from above findings</p> <p>Distributive Fairness and TPAD not properly defined.</p> <p>Reference 33 in text but only 19 in reference list.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Chandra Mohan Singh
Department, University & Country	Lakhmi Chand Institute of Technology, Swami Vivekananda Technical University, India