

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121722
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Literature Review on the Mentorship of Early Career Teachers in Rural Appalachia: Overcoming Challenges and Enhancing Student Success
Type of the Article	Review 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>
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.	The paper articulates the challenges Early Career Teachers face and how mentorship can be used to address these challenges. Hence, the paper contributes knowledge to the field of in-service teacher's professional development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of article 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.	Yes, abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsection and structure of the manuscript 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 correct because it uses empirical studies to make the arguments. Also, most of literature cited is recent. The conclusions emerges from empirical evidence accordingly.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are recent and sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author should improve the methodology section by providing the justification, ad citing some authority accordingly.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article contribute to improvement of quality of teachers.	

Review Form 3

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:	Fredrick Ssempala
Department, University & Country	Kabale University, Uganda