

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_106944
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AWKA SOUTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA
Type of the Article	Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Somehow it is. It is suggested that the author add the use of inferential statistics to get relationship between variables because descriptive ones are shallow in its treatment and are not appropriate for crafting conclusion. It is the inferential statistics which will show significance of relationship, difference, effect or impact of one variable to another. 2. The title is already suitable and suggestive of the content of the material. 3. The abstract needs to have English critique assistance especially on the aspect of sudden capitalization of letter that is unnecessary, sentence fragmentation issue, and phrasing that cannot stand alone. 4. The Statement of the Problem found in pages 4-5 is amiss. There were no specific questions posted for the reader to verify in the findings and discussion if they were dealt with. 5. Tables 2, 3 and 4 should each have a general average for the 5 items that it shows, and each average should have an interpretation, like, high level, moderate level, low level and very low level. The recommended range of values are 3.26 – 4.00 (high level), 2.51 – 3.25 (moderate level), 1.76 – 2.50 (low level), and 1.00 – 1.75 (very low level). But these levels should have a descriptor like high level of satisfaction, or high level of acceptance, whichever is applicable. More so, the word “significant” in each table should not be used because this word is only used when inferential statistics is used, like Pearson-R. It is suggested that that author use Pearson-R in looking at the relationship of variables. 6. Additional references can be added, like three more references, so as to really bridge the gap between what is known and what is still to be known. There are just 9 references, and these are few. <p>Additional</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. In the second to the last sentence of the abstract, it was written “It was recommended...”, then at the last sentence, it went back into findings and discussion because it says “It was found that...” 8. The in-text citation for authors more than 3 should use “et. al.” like Olokundun, Falola, Stephen and Inelo (2014) on page 2. 9. Referencing style should follow the latest APA edition. The source journal should be italicized. 10. There are atleast one in-text citation which is not properly acknowledged in the Reference list like Iroegbu, 2017 on page 2. 11. The real limit found in page 9 is not in itself real because the values greater than 4 cannot be attained no matter what happen. The participants highest choice is 4, and therefore, values greater than 4 cannot be reached no matter what happens. 12. The abstract and the sample size declared in page 7 says that the respondents is 120, but in actuality, it is just 95 (page 9). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The manuscript, especially the abstract, needs English critiquing.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The article will be able to have decision lik “significant” or “non-significant” if inferential Statistics will be used. It is highly suggested that Pearson-R be used to test correlation between variables, and provide statistically sound conclusion.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Elymar A. Pascual
Department, University & Country	Philippines