

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_119673
Title of the Manuscript:	PROJECT SOBER (Strengthening Our Basic Education Research): RESEARCH CAPACITY BUILDING FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION- DIVISION OF OCCIDENTAL MINDORO
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This research study aims to solve an existing problem in a particular organization, with a specific context, in the form of an Action Research (AR). This makes the manuscript become relatively significant in its field because it is one of many examples of how Action Research can be conducted in a formal setting to bring out positive results and necessary changes. 2. The length of the title is acceptable. The title manages to briefly summarize the whole study. 3. The abstract is well-structured and includes almost all necessary parts. However, there should be one sentence stating the implications and recommendations for further research. Moreover, the choice of the key words does not seem to be reasonable (e.g., capability, result demonstration). The key words need to be straightforwardly related to the study, such as research capacity. 4. The structure of the manuscript is good, and follows the general format of a research paper. However, sections Discussion and Conclusion should be in the singular form, not the plural form. Also, the section Recommendations does not seem to provide the necessary information. In this section, the researchers are supposed to come to terms with existing limitations of their research, from which the readers can take into consideration when conducting further research in the future. It is also a chance for the researchers to propose closely-related topics to the present study for other researchers to further explore this matter. 5. The manuscript is scientifically acceptable, under the condition of minor revisions. 6. The references are not perfectly sufficient due to the fact that there are three papers/works that were in-text cited without being cited in the references: <u>Bogdan & Bilken, 1992; Mills, 2011; Axinn (1988)</u> Also, the references need checking and revising so that they are APA 7th formatted. 7. Section Methodologies for the implementation is one of the most important sections in this paper; however, it is not clearly described with sufficient information. The researchers should consider describing the implementation procedure step by step, with information about time length of each stage, what is done in each stage and who is responsible for each stage. For example, the first stage of the implementation is to make official announcement about the project. The time length may be within one week, with meetings of different levels (department => sub-department => group), and the principal is responsible for this. The reason why this section should be significantly refined is that this could set an example for other researchers who are willing to conduct Action Research at their organization. Moreover, the use of visual aids such as figures or tables is obviously encouraged. 8. Section Discussion should focus on showing the similarities and differences between the current study with previous attempts, so as to highlight the prominent findings or findings that can be considered breakthroughs. At the moment, the Discussion section is doing quite many things that aren't supposed to be in this section: scope of the study and limitations. The scope of the study is supposed to be in the part where the aims of the study and research questions are stated. Because this study does not have this part, the researchers can consider including these at the end of the Literature Review section. For the limitations, it should be in the Recommendations section, where suggestions for further research are stated. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The use of language in this research paper is scholarly enough, despite minor errors related to grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Nguyen Hoang Xuan Chieu
Department, University & Country	University of Social Sciences and Humanities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam