



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_53279
Title of the Manuscript:	Secondary School Teachers, their Views and Roles in Grassroots Soccer as an Intervention Anti-HIV/AIDS Propagation Tool
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

	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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABSTRACT needs to capture entire study. What the author has presented at abstract and findings section differs. Did the author interview adolescent group? <i>"The majority of adolescents (62.2%) reported the teacher as their source of information on HIV". Methodology identifies teachers as the target population but now adolescent?</i> • The author needs to reorganize the entire study because it is either the author hasn't acknowledged sources or the study had been done before field survey... e.g. <i>The role of the secondary school teachers was limited to providing conducting schedules for the adolescents to attend the GRSZ sessions with the trained coaches.</i> • There is need to summarize the background and consider bringing out key information while ensuring the study problem or issue is clear. • Clarity is lacking in the study. Some sections are hanging and confuses the reader. e.g. <i>By removing the teacher from participating actively in the GRSZ programs was hoped will enable controlled freedom...</i> • What is the role of this..... <i>"The aunts and uncles had a moral standing..."</i> as used in the study. • The author talks of evaluation of perceptions at the METHODOLOGY... My question: What do the author wants to study? Conduct evaluation? e.g. <i>"This study was an evaluation of the perceptions of secondary school teachers who were involved as enablers of GRSZ programs"</i>. This is confusing and doesn't speak for the topic • On the SAMPLE, you are using expert guidelines but again you bring in your experience. Which technique did you use exactly? What do you mean by 18-24 sample size? You need to show what this. • 2.1.4.....; 2.2.....; ...2.2.1..... this needs to be combined and summarized but provide only key messages e.g. which tool, who to collect the data from and why such tools... • 2.2.3... provide how data is managed and analysed. Some content falls under data collection procedures... • STUDY FINDINGS is often presented a summarized format. It is not about results from teachers interview or discussion of teachers interview. It you the author who is doing the study and it is your presentation. Formalize the findings. Also, present only key findings and you need to write something rather copy pasting respondent's response. • CONCLUSION. Please conclude only what has been observed and not what you think or read from other sources. • As it is, the findings, discussions and conclusion doesn't speak or address the topic. I was expecting to see findings, discussion and conclusion of these variables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Secondary School Teachers 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grassroots Soccer ○ as an Intervention Anti-HIV/AIDS Propagation Tool.. • What the author has presented is TEACHERS VS GRSZ programs IGNORING their role in Intervention Anti-HIV/AIDS Propagation Tool.. 	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abraham Kisang
Department, University & Country	Kenya