

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_86617
Title of the Manuscript:	Initial Teachers Preparation in Tanzania: Analysis of Enrollment Policies in Teacher Education. A Review
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The topic was a good one but the researcher approached it wrongly as from every indication, the author was trying to replicate the work in his own country.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the first instance the boxing of the abstract was an indication that he lifted the work from somewhere.</li> <li>2. The author should indicate research method and the main instrument used in collecting data (Document Analysis) for the study and the method used in analyzing the data collected before talking of the outcome. In re-writing the abstract, the author should re-caste the sentences underlined so as to drive home the real message.</li> <li>3. It is not a crime in research to replicate a work in one's locality but is is a crime when it is done verbatim, the author should be advised to refrain from the practice as there are many indications to that in the work.</li> <li>4. The author should come up with specific statement of the problem.</li> <li>5. The objectives of this study ought to be stated and if possible research questions formulated before the 'literature review'</li> <li>6. The author should follow the guide as indicated in the main work. He should apply where blue is used, delete where red is used and recast where underlined.</li> <li>7. The literature review was over=clustered because of the 'copy and paste' he did.</li> <li>8. In tr-writing the review, the author should do away with pagination in-text citations.</li> <li>9. The review sub-heading should be re-numbered as indicated 2.1 instead of [11]</li> <li>10. The underlined research questions after the literature review should come after stating the objectives/purpose of the study which comes immediately after the introduction or statement of the problem as the case may be.. The review is so clustered an indication of 'copy and paste.' work. The author should do away with pagination in-text citations as commonly noticed in the review.</li> <li>11. Under methodology, 'Document Analysis should be explained as main source used in gathering data for the study with a follow up of how the data collected through the documents were analyzed</li> <li>12. The author should tell the readers the type and nature of data collected before discussion. One cannot discuss what is not seen. The author should come up with 'Document Analysis Guide" to enable him present the data collected from both the primary and secondary sources or treat the topic as 'an overview'</li> <li>13. The result discussion was more or less another literature review that is why it is suggested that the author reframe the entire work as AN OVERVIEW.</li> <li>14. In the conclusion, the author should delete the introductory sentence as it was not necessary.</li> <li>15. It is not ideal in research to apply alphabetical arrangement order of references and at the same time use chronological order. The author should find out the journal pattern and apply same. Inconsistency in the citation of journal volumes and issues as well as pagination.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Not all that as t is not a crime to replicate a work to suit your community but the approach matters.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Onwubiko Emmanuel Chidiadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Nigeria</b>