

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_115385
Title of the Manuscript:	ACADEMIC INSPIRATIONS AND PROLIFIC SCHOOL VALUES AMONG PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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. Yes it is very important it will address the gap of the area of research in academic inspiration of teachers in elementary schools 2. The topic is suitable since the topic is trying to challenge on the academic inspirations and prolific school values among public elementary school teachers 3. In my opinion there is a lot of gaps in the abstract because there quite a lot of information left in abstract and also in the body thus there is no flow of ideas example in abstract there is no objective, hypothesis purpose and theory used in study and when you go to the body of the study there is no information also purpose of study not clearly stated need to be customised. The findings should be well summarised and ensure all the findings are captured but in the body there are a lot of findings. It also good to state the p-value that will show whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Researcher has a very lengthy introduction there are main areas left out which are appearing to the document very well. 4. The structure of the manuscript is okay if incorporate the above information in number 3 It will be able for a reader to know what the researcher is trying to work on 5. It is scientifically correct and the study has a lot of insight there only need to reorganise the work to have a good flow example in conclusion the researcher should summarise all findings in recommendations he has stated ethical consideration this could come early in the content. There was need to show the gap of study and also the state the statement of the problem. 6. The reference is very good is very current and in APA format and very relevant to the content given of the study. All the tables were in APA formats very good work and with good analysis of the tables. 7. There is need to use the standard word of research example use data correction instead of data gathering. In report finding in table 3.3 the researcher has used p value of 0.00 instead of 0.05 which serves at base of the finding. In conclusion the researcher should ensure that the finding and hypothesis are well stated. In research design the researcher has defined terms so much has defined quantitative qualitative in which he should go direct to the way designed was used to analyse the data. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>it suitable for scholarly work</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is good and it has minor corrected especially on abstracts and sub-heading the rest is a wonderful contribution. if well address the document is good for adding knowledge to the globe The document need some editing and it will be very good to the contribution of knowledge</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:	John Gathage Kunga
Department, University & Country	Kirinyaga University, Kenya