

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129755
Title of the Manuscript:	NAVIGATING CAREER STAGNATION: THE LIVED EXPERIENCES OF UNPROMOTED SEASONED TEACHERS
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study provides rich information on the context, reflects the experience of the Respondents which the study intends to communicate. It may be the milestone in the field of teacher's education and those who want to choose teaching as a profession. This work will give rich information to the scientific community as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article reflect the whole idea of research.	
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.	Purpose, and findings are more clear, need to clarify the Methodological part. Specially sample selection procedure, tools validation and using verbatim	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Description is well. Problem statement needs to be clearly stated. A few relevant literatures are consulted. Contextual Part is properly stated. Needs to maintain cohesion between research context and the stated research questions	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is adequate recent references. Citation is proper in its style, and relevancy.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article well articulates the ideas with good communicative language and style. But language edition, proof reading, grammatical correction is required.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study provides rich information on the context, reflects the experience of the respondents which the study intends to communicate. The write up seems good in terms of English language and style. Formatting is not adequately polished. Minor errors are rampant. Need a thorough revision before final decision to publish.	

#### 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:	Samjhana Basnyat
Department, University & Country	Tribhuban University, Nepal