

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
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	Literature 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 topic of the article is relevant. There is a continuous need to review the outcome of empirical studies conducted in the field of capacity building of teachers. Also, in the shifting context of online education and deployment of Artificial Intelligence in education sector, the importance of this topic has become more relevant. However, the article does not appear to dive deep into the existing body of knowledge and thus may not provide any additional highlights and/or insights in the topic. The conclusion of the article also does not seem to be useful for policy making and course correction.	
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.	The abstract is able to convey the summary of the article. However, the abstract does not highlight the country wide range of the papers reviewed and limitations thereof of the conclusion drawn. Definitions of the keywords e.g. staff development and job productivity are not clear and thus the abstract presents a very general picture.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction section broadly elaborates the relationship between teachers' quality and quality of education. However, various keywords and terms used to formulate the research objectives are not appropriately defined or explained.</p> <p>There is no literature survey section. As a result it is not possible to understand the whether a similar paper review is conducted earlier or not.</p> <p>In the methodology section, it was mentioned that the researcher searched a wide range of academic databases and respected publications for relevant literature for this review. However, the criteria for selection of these specific 15 papers, other than publication during last five years, are not given.</p> <p>The review section provides a brief of each of these 15 papers as separate sub section. It was expected that an Analysis section will summarise the review and provide a comparison of results or outcome of these papers under review. This would have further led to the conclusion. However, this exercise is not done and the conclusion section is written without a synthesis.</p> <p>The second purpose of the study, that is , 'Critique the empirical studies on staff development and teachers' job productivity in educational institutions' is not addressed to in the conclusion section.</p>	

Review Form 3

	The reviewed papers are from different parts of the World, as such, the context may not be similar. As a result, the outcomes of these papers may not be generalised to a specific country. Limitations of the study and scope of further work needs to be added to the paper.	
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.	<p>Theoretical framework linking capacity building and job productivity of teachers as well as their influence on quality of education as a whole is not substantially supported by existing body of knowledge. In the introduction section, an attempt has been made in this regard; however, the references are mostly in the context of Africa. The author attempted to validate the framework using literature review methodology. In that case, rationale for selection of literatures for review, other than published in last five years, may be clearly defined. While reviewing each literature, beside survey methodology and outcome, limitations of the study under review in the given context may also be mentioned.</p> <p>Further, a comparative statement synthesizing the review of all papers will be useful to appreciate the study.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, comments on similar reviews done earlier, addressing research objectives clearly, adding Analysis section and elaborating limitations of the study would be essential to make the manuscript robust and technically sound.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly in the context of Africa. References from other countries will be useful.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many grammatical and punctuation errors in the manuscripts. The language/English quality may need further editing for scholarly communication.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript may be revised based on above observations.	

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:	Yasmin
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi National Open University, India