

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_107998
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptions of B.Ed students on the topic of understanding the disciplines and academic subjects available in Teacher Education Programs
Type of the Article	Original 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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Not Suitable. I suggest that since the author is inclined towards a Quantitative study, He/she needs variables in the topic. On reading the work, it seems to suggest the following variables:</p> <p>a) Dependent variable—Variations in Comprehension of Disciplines/Subjects b) Independent Variable—Learner experiences</p> <p>So, the topic would be: <i>Learner experiences and variations in comprehension of particular disciplines in the BED program</i></p> <p>For this title the author needs to derive the objectives of the study from the conceptualization above. How is he/she measuring learner experiences? What are the indicators of focus with regard to comprehension of disciplines? After getting these, then the author would develop SPECIFIC objectives/research questions/hypotheses.</p> <p>Not comprehensive. One fails to know exactly what the author set out to do, how he/she did it and what were the summary results and conclusions. Therefore, the abstract SHOULD be not more than 150 words—focus on the major objective, precise methodology, summary results and conclusions.</p> <p>Not appropriate. The manuscript lacks many sections of a scientific paper. Deploy the ILMRD approach to write a better manuscript. I(Introduction), L (Literature review), M (Methods), R(Results), D(Discussion). Secondly, the section of literature review is very insufficient and the literature gaps are not highlighted properly. There are no debates in the section. The introduction has many redundant information which is out of context to the issue at hand, and no in-text-references throughout the article. On page 2-3, sentences are disjointed/disoriented from the major focus of the manuscript. For instance, the author is talking about student interests, pedagogy, multidisciplinary approach, which aspects are totally out of context. So, recast the manuscript. The introduction/background should be handy explaining what the title is about (rationale for the manuscript) from a global, historical and national context.</p> <p>References would be sufficient and recent but since they are not reflected in the text (Using APA format), it is hard to qualify their sufficiency</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>For the time being, the language is appropriate</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>So, the topic would be: <i>Learner experiences and variations in comprehension of particular disciplines in the BED program</i></p> <p>The study objective would be: To examine how learner experiences influence/affect variations in how they comprehend particular disciplines in the BED program</p> <p>Provide objectives of the study derived from the conceptual framework/conceptualization</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective 2. Design 3. Results (precisely) 4. Conclusions (derived from results, precisely) <p>Note: All this SHOULD be in prose.</p> <p>For the Methods Provide: Research approach—Quantitative Research design—Survey (but which survey? Either cross-sectional, descriptive, etc)</p> <p>Data collection—Is it a structured questionnaire or semi-structured? Select which.</p> <p>Data analysis Show the methods for analysing each objective/research question/hypotheses.</p> <p>Integrate the references in the Text. Use either APA, Harvard, or Chicago as the Journal subscribes.</p>	<p>Follow a proper scientific style recommended by this journal.</p>
	<p>Work on grammar, punctuation and tenses.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Denis Sekiwu</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kabale University, Uganda</p>