

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_123602
Title of the Manuscript:	Teacher Achievement Motivation and Students Academic Performance in Science Subjects in The Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Ijara Sub County, Kenya
Type of the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>"Teacher Achievement Motivation and Students Academic Performance in Science Subjects" is indeed important to the science community because a lot of research has shown that teachers' motivation and quality significantly impact students' academic performance in Science, especially in Mathematics</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provided is quite detailed and covers several key aspects of the study. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved for clarity and comprehensiveness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Typographical Errors: Several grammatical errors and typos need correction. For example, "post give significantly high affected" should be "positively and significantly affected." 2. Structure and Flow: The abstract could benefit from a clearer structure. Breaking it into distinct sections (e.g., background, methodology, results, conclusion) can help improve readability. 3. Statistical Results: The presentation of statistical results should be more consistent. For instance, "$r=0.447 = 0.254$" seems to have a formatting error. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes. The study appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. It follows standard research practices, uses appropriate methodologies, and provides clear and significant findings. It presents its findings clearly, showing significant positive effects of various digital transformation technologies on financial reporting quality. The statistical significance ($p < 0.01$) and the reported correlation coefficients indicate a strong relationship between the variables.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Nilda V. San Miguel
Department, University & Country	Lumban Central Elementary School, Philippines