

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_79128
Title of the Manuscript:	Teachers' Pedagogical Competence in Dealing with Teaching Aids in Tanzania: A case of a Few Finalist Pre-service Science-Teachers
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article presented is based on a very important and actual topic. The study is of local importance (partly nationally, describing the competence of Tanzanian teachers in this aspect).</p> <p>The aim and tasks of the study are appropriately worded in the introduction, but the article deals with the topic more broadly. Therefore, the focus of the study can be reviewed and really kept on the teaching aids, not the organization of the class, the involvement of students, the development of students' general skills, self-management, etc. (which are also very important aspects in themselves).</p> <p>Methodologically observations and documents have been used. Their association could certainly be added individually. There are no interpretations of what is included in the lesson plans. Examples would also be welcome when conducting a qualitative study. Currently, only one figure has four options and the teacher's position in the classroom. The methodology also mentions teachers' conversations (statements), which should be included in the case of qualitative research and could be added directly. Figure 1, table 1 explains that the data are presented quantitatively. Add this explanation to the methodology.</p> <p>The number of participants in the study varies in different sections of the article. Written at the beginning of the article 25, at the end 15 (?..<i>These findings were obtained after investigating only 15 finalist university student-teachers of sciences studying at one university.</i>)</p> <p>The references referred to in the article are all in the list, but be sure to put them alphabetically.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Add the number of participants in the title of the illustrative material, figure and table (n = 25 or 15?).</p> <p>In the case of a qualitative study, also indicate differences (for example, positive solutions).</p> <p>Methodologically observations and documents have been used. Their association could certainly be added individually. There are no interpretations of what is included in the lesson plans.</p> <p>You write that <i>..Based on the findings, the finalist university student-teachers' ability to select, design, and professionally unpack teaching aids was limited as most of the materials they employed had didactic, structural, and technical concerns ...</i> set out the recommendations in more detail.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is very important to address this issue. The connection between teaching and developing vital understanding in students is very necessary, in addition to motivating and others. In order to support the development of students' general skills and self-management, it is necessary to improve the use of different study materials in lessons and the different ways of creating them. If the teacher is creative, he or she will find suitable tools in his or her professional baggage, taking into account the given time factor.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maarika Veigel
Department, University & Country	Tallinn University, Estonia