

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_129631
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION AND SERVICE EFFICACY OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	When the study is evaluated in general, it can be evaluated as an original study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It 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.	Problem situation or aim and sub problems/hypotheses should be added. The scales should be explained clearly. The scale of the scales is not specified. It is not clear whether it is a five-point score from high to low or a scale expressing opinions such as agree-disagree. Discussion part should be developed with comment.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The statistics appear to be accurate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	When the study is evaluated in general, it can be evaluated as an original study. However, there are some deficiencies that prevent the reader from understanding more clearly. The clear writing of the purpose and hypotheses in the introduction section makes it easier to follow the process followed in the research. However, in this article, the sentence that resembles the purpose sentence written in the introduction section but is used as an explanation does not match the work done. It is not clear who and when the scales used in the study were developed, and if they were developed by the researchers, the process followed is not sufficient. This section needs to be revised. The meaning of the findings obtained should first be interpreted by the author/authors. It would be more appropriate to discuss them with the relevant literature later.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Şenay Sezgin Nartgün
Department, University & Country	Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Türkiye