

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_129993
Title of the Manuscript:	Emotional Maturity & Psychological Wellbeing as Predictor of Teachers' Professional Development for Integrated Teacher Education Programme: An Analysis
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>

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.	Besides structural quality indicators of educational environments, the process quality indicators gained importance in this century. Accordingly, this study gives importance to the factors influencing process quality by reviewing the concepts of emotional maturity and psychological well-being for teachers' professional development and overall well-being. Process quality indicators mainly care about teacher-child interactions considering the socio-cultural elements surrounding these relationships. Literature investigating on teacher-child dynamics direct its attention to teachers' own well-being to navigate complex issues in the management of educational processes. Thus, after conducting revisions, this review study could direct scholarly community to better understand the reciprocal relations between teachers' overall well-being, educational outcomes, and support mechanisms to heal the conditions of teachers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The sentence structure (x predicts y) in the title sounds like this study was part of correlational or experimental study, or meta-analysis instead of review study. Also, the statement "...: An analysis" seems incomplete to take the attention of readers. What analysis? Or What is the case? Alternatively, the author (s) might prefer to write the title like: Adjacent Concepts of Teachers' Professional Development for Integrated Teacher Education Programme: Review of Emotional Maturity & Psychological Wellbeing Even this title seems long to capture the essence/core of the study. The author(s) need to determine key concepts outlined in the title and abstract, and follow the similar terminology throughout the study. They could prefer umbrella terms in order not to replicate similar concepts with differing wording if the nuances of these terms do not make such difference.	

Review Form 3

<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>Abstract seems like reflecting conclusion part with authors concluding remarks carrying some kind of subjective standpoint with directive words like “must”, or offering causality for recommendations. The abstract need to indicate the study’s significance by reflecting the key discussions and research need considering the issue of interest (of course without citations but reflecting the key essence of the issue in pertaining literature). Instead of allocating so much space to the general importance of the study, outline the key significance and link this significance to your intended methodology. Selected terms need to be consistent (i.e., emotional intelligence vs emotional maturity). If all these terms are parts of the study, due weight need to be given to all of them from title to key words. Otherwise, author(s) need to make more clear and justified word selection. Research questions need to be revised by changing the word “Predict” for the reasons as explained in the title comments. When explaining methodology, explain how this review becomes analytic. What about data sources and etc. Authors could write each sentence point by point for purpose and significance linked to methodology. Then give some details about utilized frameworks and share some significant implications. Then you could synthesize them in one paragraph. Otherwise, this abstract could not help readers to catch the significance, key terms, justification of methodology, and key impacts.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>This study needs to make revisions to meet the criteria’s of scientific research. At the end of each section, author (s) need to make clear their pathway to continue another part. Particularly, at the end of the introduction part, author (s) could explain their aim connected with study’s overall significance and methodology. Then, they need to guide readers about the flow of the article. In the literature sections, the author (s) explain each concept with related references. However, they need to connect each concept to each other in some way so that readers could catch the relevance of these concepts with each other. Otherwise, it seems we are looking encyclopaedia section of each concept separately. Even though author(s) attempted to connect them in discussion and conclusion parts, we need to see interrelatedness of each concept with each other from beginning to end. So, author(s) need to make analytic synthesis throughout their writing particularly at the end of each section. In the methodology part, selection of sources for review could be indicated with table or figure by indicating the number of sources from beginning to the selected sources. What about analysis? What is the criteria for determining “prediction and impact” what about significance values, effect sizes, and further calculations? The way of presenting results need to be analytic and based on the scientific criteria for claiming any prediction and impact. The author(s) need to explain the analysis of prediction, and provide the information about selected sources in figure(s) or table (s) to make results much more clear, analytic and scientific.</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, the references are sufficient and recent. But, for enhancing methodology part, author(s) could benefit from related sources to justify the study based on the revisions.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language is clear and understandable for scholarly audience.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Seyda Karan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University, Türkiye</p>