

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	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community 2. The title of the article is very suitable 3. The abstract is comprehensive. However, the author may consider removing the literature part from the abstract. The methods used to analyse the data from the questionnaire and interviews would have been reported under abstract and research methodology. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are very appropriate 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct because some of the scientific procedures were reported 6. The references sufficient and recent. However, the author wrote on references not cited in the manuscript. Therefore, only references that have been acknowledged in the manuscript should be reported under this section. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author used English in the manuscript. The quality of the English used in the article is scholarly suitable for communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a well written manuscript. However, the author may consider removing the abstract from the abstract and report on both abstract and research methodology section, the methods used to analyse the data from the sources reported</p> <p>The references should only be those that have been acknowledged in the manuscript. Thus should go through the manuscript and revisit this section</p> <p>Accepted subject to minor corrections as indicated in part 1: subsection 3 which recommended the removal of the literature review from the abstract and inclusion of methods used to analyse data from the questionnaire and interview under abstract, and subsection 6 on the inclusion of only sources cited in the article should be reported under references.</p> <p>The methods used to analyse data from the questionnaire and interview should also be included under research methodology section.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Nephat Kasebusha
Department, University & Country	University of Zambia, Zambia