

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_77905
Title of the Manuscript:	Area Of Specialization and Teaching Performance Among Secondary School Science Teachers in Content Knowledge and Its Application Within and Across Curriculum Areas
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

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	<p>You conducted a chi-square test. What exactly was the test conducted on? I am unsure. Because of your degrees of freedom, I suspect you might have also used the overall. That can be problematic because it might violate the rule of singularity (the overall is a composite of the three other scores). You should also report a p value.</p> <p>What program did you use to conduct the test?</p> <p>How/when was the questionnaire administered?</p> <p>Why did you pick a sample of 46? Did anyone drop out or fail to complete the form?</p> <p>Maybe I missed this, but weighted means need an explanation.</p> <p>All good research has a limitations section.</p> <p>Can you develop more risqué recommendations beyond the normal?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>You claim validity and reliability of the construction of your research question. I think you use the words generally and not scientifically. Since you neither report nor mention any qualitative or quantitative tests for reliability and validity, I believe there is no reliability or validity. Either provide the qualitative and the quantitative methodology or withdraw such a statement</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Clean up bibliography. Sometimes titles are not italicized, you spell out the first name, spacing, and other stylistic problems.</p> <p>The paper could profit from being proofread and edited.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA