

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_114902
Title of the Manuscript:	Research Self-efficacy Among Ph.D. Research Scholars: A Survey Study
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> Yes, the article is important for scientific community. The title of the article is suitable. The abstract should start with atleast one word introduction/rationale, before stating the purpose of the study. The subsections and structure are appropriate. The declaration that male participants obtain "slightly higher research efficacy" should not be part of the findings because in the latter part, it was observed that there is no significant ditinction in research self-efficacy concerning the sample's gender. The author/s did well in referencing, using the latest APA style of referencing. There is also a good number of items in the reference list. <p>* Aside from internal analysis of the inferential stat results, there should be external analysis through citation of previously accomplished studies, showing comparison or contrast of results. It can also be an explanation of the result of present findings based on the literature gathered.</p> <p>* Table 8 has a title "t-test...", but the statistics used is ANOVA. Therefore, it should have been "F-test..."</p> <p>* Having 92 participants is not a limitation, since a simple random sampling is employed. What should be written in the lmitation is the scarcity of factors tested, in which, all of the factors tested turned out to be of no significant difference. The author should recommend other factors to be tested which he deemed academically possible to have significant difference in terms of research efficacy.</p> <p>* Table 2 should have a legend or range of values for the research efficacy. For example 100-109 very low efficacy, 110-118 low efficacy, 119-127 moderate efficacy, 128-136 high efficacy. This is just a sample. This will show the lowest value and highest value of efficacy. More so, it will provide answer to the question of the level of efficacy of the researchers, rather than saying that the level of efficacy of researchers is 128.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The type of researcher was not clear as to how the classification was done. It is more possible that they are not type of researcher, but status of work or university contract (full-time and part-time). It is suggested that the author go ober this possible classification, that is, instead of type of researcher, it should be status of work.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author did well in this study. There are just some portions to be fixed as mentioned above.</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:	Elymar A. Pascual
Department, University & Country	Philippines