



**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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recasts the working title to scholarly reflects better the intended primary objective and as could be supported by the specific objectives of the paper.</li> <li>For the <b>Research Methodology</b> section, kindly take note of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflect how potential biases and effect of mediating variables were addressed to assure excellent generalizability of results.</li> <li>Establish reliability and validity of the research instrument.</li> <li>Provide specific details whenever necessary like for example specific statistical tool used among others.</li> </ul> </li> <li>For the <b>Results and Discussion</b> section, kindly take note of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add second and third level interpretation of results.</li> <li>Make discussions scholarly and rich and situate better eventual conclusions and/or recommendations.</li> <li>Adopt standard format for the presentation of results of statistical analyses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Better organization and/or form of research manuscript is/are highly suggested to make the paper more scholarly convincing.</li> </ul>	<p>I accepted your suggestions and made the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I changed the title of the article so that it better reflects the primary purpose of the research</li> <li>- I have aligned the subject with the research goals</li> <li>- I have worked out the Summary, and outlined the basic information about the research</li> <li>- I have supplemented the Introduction and Conclusion</li> <li>- I revised the introductory subchapters and omitted the superfluous parts of the text</li> <li>- I have separated the chapters Results and Discussion (I have further elaborated on the obtained results, setting out more concrete conclusions)</li> <li>- I have edited the vocabulary and the syntax so that the empirical research suits the scientific discourse</li> <li>- I have only included the titles cited in the article in the Reference List.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fundamentally, only inferential research objectives require hypotheses. If in case and as presented, said may only apply to research objective #1.</li> <li>Follow suggested format for the <b>Reference</b> section of the paper (even for the other sections of the paper whenever applicable).</li> </ul>	I have further elaborated on the chapter Research Methodology (aligned the research objectives with the hypothesis, added tables containing survey results).
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper is very interesting and publishable pending the suggested enrichments.</li> </ul>	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.

**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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	