

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_AIR_118013</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Emotional and Psychological States of Junior High School Teachers: A Case Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Not in its present form.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The name of Ghana should be added to the title.</b></li> <li>3. <b>No, the abstract describes conclusions but not how they were reached.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Yes, subsections are appropriate.</b></li> <li>5. <b>No, the manuscript has scientific problems.</b></li> <li>6. <b>The background references are strong.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Minor editing for English is needed</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indicate Ghana in the title (it is important to locate the study).</li> <li>2. The abstract jumps straight to conclusions and gives no evidence of how they were reached.</li> <li>3. The paper has neither line numbers nor page numbers, making it difficult to locate errors.</li> <li>4. There are minor weakness in English that an editor could correct.</li> <li>5. The authors make a good argument for the need for their study.</li> <li>6. In Research Design, the sample size is mentioned as both 200 and 340. Which is it?</li> <li>7. Tables 1 and 2 should be combined into one table. The authors should omit some material. They should not directly copy SPSS tables into their articles as these include unneeded materials.</li> <li>8. Table 3 can be omitted as the information is in Table 4.</li> <li>9. In talking about the Data Collection Instrument, the authors refer to a pilot study. They only report alpha from this study. More information would be useful (factor structure? Norms?)</li> <li>10. The authors indicate the presence of 5 factors that explain 60% of the variance. They do not describe the factors, or consider the use of subscales.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>11. The authors then move on to a discussion of individual items in terms of percentage of respondents answering in different ways. This is their “case study”. There is probably some value to this information but it is very much in a pick and choose form.</p> <p>I advise against publication of this paper for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors used a self-developed instrument that they had not analyzed completely. They provided no evidence of validity or test retest reliability.</li> <li>2. The authors did not explain the results of their factor analysis.</li> <li>3. The authors dwelt on individual questions in a matter that suggested inexperience as researchers.</li> </ol> <p>However, there were some strong points of the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The literature review was good, and the logic for the research was well developed</li> <li>2. Factor analysis data are interesting and could be followed.</li> <li>3. Some normative standards for the test should be developed, perhaps even for subscales.</li> </ol> <p>There is a lot of work to be done before this research is publishable, but the authors have the data they need and could proceed to improve their article.</p>	
--	--	--

**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>
<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:	<b>Cynthia Whissell</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Laurentian University, Canada</b>