



Paper: “Way Forward for Teacher Professional Development in Kenya: Utilization of Performance Appraisal Reports”

Corresponding Author: Damaris Kariuki

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p230

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Khitam Mousa Ay
University of Jordan, Jordan

Reviewer 3: Asif Jamil
Gomal University, Pakistan

Reviewer 4: Hanaa Ouda Khadri
Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

Published: 30.06.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:Khitam Mousa Ay	Email:
University/Country:The University of Jordan- Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: 5 May 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Utilization of performance appraisal reports:way forward for teacher professional development in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0504/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper : Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
clear and adequate title to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The study expressed well and clearly its goal and method	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
Very few	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
yes	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Very few grammatical errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Yes, although It is preferable to add some references from European Scientific Journal data	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	*
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof Dr Asif Jamil	Email:
University/Country: Gomal University Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/30/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/5/2020
Manuscript Title: Utilization of performance appraisal reports: way forward for teacher professional development in Kenya	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.05.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> As regards the title of the study, to me it is purposeful and revealing what the researchers intend to dig out, applying the process of research	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract is ok, however research method and design needs to be rephrased	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ignorable	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Needs to be revisited and rephrased. Authors claimed they used Descriptive survey design which is purely a quantitative method, whereas contrary to that it has been claimed that the data was collected using Questionnaire as well as Interview. Contradiction is further apparent as it has been stated that quantitative data was analysed using Descriptive analysis and qualitative data was analysed thematically. It seems as if it was a Mixed method study, using simultaneously both quantitative and qualitative designs. Same is the case in discussion and findings where findings have been revealed in a manner befitting to above mentioned mixed method. 2. Demographic variables e.g. Gender etc. not clarified. 3. Sampling techniques and procedure needs to be clarified as it looks as if multiphase sampling procedure was adopted. 	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No apparent errors found	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is OK	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No issue	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A good effort in deed, revelation of research methods need due attention

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: