

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3050
Title of the Manuscript:	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION AND PERFORMANCE LAG ADDRESS PROGRAM (PLAP): A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FORMER GROUP A (SI) AND FORMER GROUP B (S2) SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MUTARE URBAN, ZIMBABWE
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is so important for scientific community as it shows the relationship between instructional supervision and Performance in secondary schools. This is important as it shows the necessity of instructional supervision to monitor teachers' activities to know whether the set objectives are being achieved and if not corrective actions are taken..	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable but it should be better if it sounds like this: Instructional Supervision of Performance Lag Address Program (PLAP) in Selected Secondary Schools in Mutare Urban, Zimbabwe.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not quite comprehensive as it does not show the research design, population, sample size, data collection tools, data analysis, conclusion and some key recommendations. Thus, I suggest that the authors may include these elements	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, however, I suggest that the authors to add the gaps in the literature to indicate the contribution of this research	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are too old, the authors have to find the recent ones. For instance: https://doi.org/10.33886/mj.v5i2.237 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0072-0326	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although some typos and grammatical errors should be fixed, the overall quality is good. See some highlighted in the text	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript sounds well and can be published in the journal after addressing the comments given by the reviewer	

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:	Emmanuel Bizimana
Department, University & Country	Protestant University, Rwanda