

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_119447
Title of the Manuscript:	ESSENTIAL SOFT SKILLS AND CLASSROOM MANAGERIAL EFFICIENCY OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript addresses an important issue within the local and global education context regarding teacher skills and continuous development to ensure quality education for the students they teach.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is concise and appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and well-written.</p> <p>4. In terms of the structure, there is no section for literature review. Instead, the author combined it briefly with the introduction which is not a sound practice. The objectives are not clearly outlined. I suggest the structure should structure the manuscript as follows... Introduction, literature review, theoretical framework, research objectives, methodology... etc</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct however theoretical framework is missing and the author needs to address this shortfall.</p> <p>6. The author incorporated current sources in the manuscript which is commendable.</p> <p>7. The author mentioned in subsection 2.2 that 132 teachers were used, but in subsection 2.4 it was indicated that teachers in 14 schools were given the questionnaire. Taking into consideration that the number of teachers in 14 schools can be identified easily, it is appropriate for the author to indicate the population of teachers within the 14 schools from which the 132 were sampled. Additionally, the author should indicate in section 2.2 that the 132 were sampled from teachers in 14 schools.</p> <p>8. In section 2.3, the author should indicate how respondents responded to the statements in the measuring instrument, whether a frequency rating scale was used or not as well as the range of ratings. This will assist readers to interpret the mean score values appropriately.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the language used is suitable but there appears to be minor grammatical errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In general, the manuscript is commendable. The author should address the minor corrections noted above.	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alex Boateng
Department, University & Country	University of South Africa, South Africa