



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_12094
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of a Teacher Mentoring Programme in Enhancing Pre-Service Chemistry Teachers' Attitude towards the Teaching Profession
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>In general, the rationale for conducting this study has merits. However, I think that the Introduction for the study could use some redrafting to clarify sentence structure and grammar. There are also run on sentences. For example, lines 28-37 are not worded clearly. I would advise to reword for clarity. The authors should also be consistent with term "teaching" or "reading" chemistry. This is confusing for the reader.</p> <p>I'm not sure that the author made the case that there is a negative attitude towards teaching based on the number of applicants to the university. Are there other variables?</p> <p>Research Question 1: Research questions are a bit leading and Question #1 could use some clarification. Perhaps: "To what extent does the TMP.....</p> <p>Research Method: Sentence 169 needs clarification. Also, I would suggest that you better explain why the quasi experimental design was chosen and not why pure experimental was not chosen.</p> <p>Instrumentation: There are several questions that are not answered regarding the TMG and/PCTAS. How was the TMG scale used in the study? If it was used to train</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>the mentors, what did the training consist of? For the PCTAS, how was this scale distributed? It was scaled back from 51 to 30—what were the reviewers overall suggestions for scaling back?</p> <p>Overall, I think this study has merits and the methods/results are well-written (with minor revisions and clarification). I also believe that the authors should consider using more up-to-date references to assure relevancy and credibility of the study/journal.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>LaRon Scott</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Virginia Commonwealth University, USA</b>