

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126780
Title of the Manuscript:	EMPIRICAL REVIEW OF STUDIES ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHERS' JOB PRODUCTIVITY IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
Type of the Article	Review

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is of utmost importance in today's time. The simultaneous development of teachers at any level of their career improves their capability and polish their skills to proficient level.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes it is comprehensive in nature.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub sections and structure requires to be refined at the level of publication.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The supporting evidence of reviews expressed in this article is appropriate and to the mark. The technical portion of the review is sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Shailla Cannie
Department, University & Country	Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University & SMVD College of Nursing, India