

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126030
Title of the Manuscript:	INSTITUTE CULTURE AND RENEWING POWER OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	this manuscript is so important for the scientific community as it highlights the predictive power of institute culture and the renewing power of public elementary school teachers. this is so important as these factors can help the teachers, and school leaders to change their traditional practices in school which may hinder the education quality	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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.	The abstract is quite comprehensive. However, the authors have to address some comments highlighted in the document reviewed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are appropriate	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. However, the authors have to show the gaps in the literature to show the contribution of this research to the existing body of knowledge.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although the manuscript's quality is somewhat good, I recommend fixing the typos and grammatical errors that are underlined in the manuscript	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript sounds well and can be published in the journal after addressing the comments given by the reviewer especially on the part of data presentation and analysis and interpretation	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Bizimana
Department, University & Country	Protestant University (PUR), Rwanda