

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86591
Title of the Manuscript:	Pedagogical Support in the Teacher: Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Review 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	Grammatical expressions: Most of the sentences are too long and have punctuation errors. The researcher (s) needs a language editor to language structure of the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The methodology employed suggest it is an original research conducted hence, it cannot be a review paper or systematic review as indicated. - The place of study needs to be properly identified. Eg. region of Libertad in which country? - The research design used was not stated. <p>KEYWORDS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The paper has only 3 keywords. I suggest an addition 2 or 3 key words could be added. <p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the first sentence of the first paragraph the words; According to andmaintains that as used is inappropriate. - In paragraph 2, it is stated According to Argomedo (2016), he points out that, in Colombia. One of these academic phrases needs to be deleted. - The research question needs to be restated and the words "a systematic review" should be deleted. - The empirical reviews cited in the introduction should not include the methodologies, the determination of the reliabilities and validity of the instruments. Only important findings related to the current study are necessary on this part. <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No pilot study was mentioned. - The sub-categories of themes that made up the questionnaire was not stated. - It did not state how the reliability, validity and trustworthiness of the instruments was established. <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the discussion, the researcher(s) could make an analysis by giving reasons why the findings were similar or different from earlier studies. It is interesting to add that. - I also suggest that the interpretation of findings and discussions should come after the table or graph. <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study did not make any recommendation. 	
Optional/General comments	This paper is publishable when all the corrections are properly effected.	

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:	Kennedy Nyeseh Ofori
Department, University & Country	Wesley University College, Ghana