



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JESBS_46646</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Teacher's Career - Scientific Fiction or Reality</b>
Type of the Article	Original research papers

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>The language of the article is very weak and the style of writing does not match the scientific approach. The results and discussions are not hitting the point. The references are old. The writer quoted some referees as Gorkey and William glasser without giving the titles or the dates of their publications.</b>	Encouraged by your critical review I tried to improve the language of the article to suit the scientific discourse. I revised the text by omitting the non-essential parts. I supplemented the chapter Research methodology and listed the titles and years of the above mentioned publications. I added current references. I have made the following changes in the text: - I changed the title of the article so that it better reflects the primary purpose of the research - I have aligned the subject with the research goals - I have worked out the Summary, and outlined the basic information about the research - I have supplemented the Introduction and Conclusion - I revised the introductory subchapters and omitted the superfluous parts of the text - I have further elaborated on the chapter Research Methodology (aligned the research objectives with the hypothesis, added tables containing survey results) - I separated the chapters Results and Discussion (I have more elaborated further on the obtained results, setting out more concrete conclusions) - I have edited the vocabulary and the syntax so that the empirical research suits the scientific discourse - I have only included the titles cited in the article in the Reference List.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-----	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	----	

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