

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_127121
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AMONG PRESCHOOL TEACHERS: TRENDS AND PRACTICES
Type of the Article	Review article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 important both for the community of researchers and, above all, for that of practitioners in preschool education. Kindergarten education lays the foundation for the entire subsequent development of the human personality. The way in which it is realized is absolutely significant for the entire subsequent evolution. It follows that it must be in agreement both with the present time (in which it takes place) but also with the future time (toward who leads), respectively the trends. In this way, educators can capitalize on the newest acquisitions of knowledge in the field.	
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.	From the point of view of content, the abstract is reasonable, however, from the point of view of organization, including technical editing, it needs improvement (logic, coherence of the presentation, technical editing).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In general, yes, but the methodology part of the research lacks many components: aim, and objectives; the methodology of the actual research, the type of research, the selection procedure of the works, the stages of the research, the duration of the research, the procedure for analyzing and interpreting the results	
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 study is interesting, but the presentation of the content needs to be improved a lot from the point of view of scientific correctness and completeness. For example: the presentation and support with bibliographic reference of the selection procedure of the works (inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria) as well as the systematized presentation of the selected works, according to each criterion and verified database; clarifying and explaining the type of research, if it is a review or systematic literature review, with bibliographic reference, to argue and support the type of research; attention to some nuances of the pedagogical language - Professional development is an intrinsic motivation (it is not an intrinsic motivation, it can be supported by... or it can be a sign of...), or What the statement means: This theoretical work included an empirical study conducted between 2005 and 2023? Is the study a theoretical analysis, of scientific articles, a review or a study of empirical practices? Did he last from 2005 to 2023? Or did he analyze articles published during this period?; a superior correlation in the text of Table 1 and Table 2, where they are, they do not correlate with the text either before or after, we do not know on what basis they were made; making the presentation of the results in a systematized and clear manner; the conclusions must be supported by the bibliography, there are no specified limitations of the research; the technical editing needs a lot of correction (wrong names, missing commas, names that are not found in the bibliographic list, unexplained omissions (UN, 2015, OECD, 2009) and that do not appear in the final bibliography, non-	

**Review Form 3**

	functional links to the final bibliography).	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	In general, YES. An appendix is required with all the titles that were selected and analyzed within the review.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I am not qualified to evaluate the quality of the English language used.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper can be improved but it requires a lot of careful work.	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Cojocariu Venera-Mihaela
Department, University & Country	"Vasile Alecsandri" University of Bacau, Romania