

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_110059
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing the Provision of Professional Development among Primary School Teachers in Kahama Municipality, Shinyanga Region, Tanzania
Type of the Article	

### 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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title completely using the general diction so it could be change into more scientifically research that represent the whole content.</li> <li>2. First sentence of abstract is background of study so that it should not add theoretical form previous researcher. The respondent in the research should be mention clearly. Give the impact in the end part of abstract and do the proof read to avoid the typo.</li> <li>3. In the introduction section need to be elaborate more regarding current the education background of Tanzania. What is happening in the Inset-PST and PD, why it is important to be discussed into a research</li> <li>4. The researcher methodology doesn't mention how analyses data was. The data analysis should be mentioned clearly in the Research method section.</li> <li>5. The result and discussion need more deeply elaborate regarding the previous research that has been mentioned in the introduction section and in the literature review. The researcher doesn't uses theoretical framework that mentioned in the introduction and literature review. But prefer using other researcher finding in the discussion section. It should be matched the whole part. Please make it aligned and consistency.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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:	<b>Diah Susanti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indonesia</b>