|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | [**An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research**](https://www.bookpi.org/bookstore/product/an-overview-of-literature-language-and-education-research-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_4290** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **Productivity in Educators** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

|  |
| --- |
| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The field of education and the performance of education and educators is an extremely important topic in contemporary society. The changes induced by various disruptive factors, especially of a technological nature, are so profound that productivity in this field is an immense challenge. Therefore, scientific contributions that can have a positive impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the educational process are always more than welcome. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The Title is not suitable for the chapter. So change is needed.It is difficult to asses ‘Productivity in Educators’. Better the title could be about productivity of educators or of the educational process, or factors that affect the productivity of educators, or how to increase educator’s productivity, etc. |  |
| 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 of the article is comprehensive but not reflect entirely the contents of the manuscript. Change needed for the Abstract. For example in the abstract is mentioned ‘adaptation of the data obtained in the study to the management of education and vocational training’, etc. but the paper does not state what study is being conducted and what kind of data resulted, so that they can then be applied/applicable further. Or, it mentions ‘the strengths of educators working in the educational system and school organizations’, but in the paper there is no clear and usable identification of these strengths. There are other aspects that could be mentioned regarding the Abstract, such as ‘suggestions and recommendations for educators to further improve their productivity’ but in the final part there are only a few general phrases, correct it is true, but with an insignificant level of relevance.  |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | From a scientific point of view, the work could be much improved.The subject is attractive and arouses many comments and debates, so it would not be difficult for the authors to increase the scientific quality of the work.The Introduction and the Literature review are treated in a general manner. These sections of the work could be more detailed and specific for the chosen topic.The research objective is quite vague and is not sufficiently well reflected in the rest of the manuscript and in Conclusions.For example, almost 3 pages out of the 7 pages of the work (of which one page is occupied by the list of references and one by the title, Abstract and a paragraph from the Introduction) represent a list of examples of possible strategies for increasing employee productivity.The manuscript do not have so far enough relevant conclusions, and useful recommendations. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The bibliography is poor, and the references used by the authors are not new enough, even if many are consistent with the chosen topic. Only two titles from 2017 were mentioned, the rest being older or even much older, especially if we take into account the significant developments in recent years in the field of education and beyond. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English language quality is poor and is not suitable for scholarly communications. The authors use very long sentences, which are difficult to follow and understand. Some words with the same meaning are used in the same sentence, such as ‘multiple assessment and evaluation’. In addition, if it is about multiple, the plural should be used (assessments, evaluations). Some sentences are confusing and do not clarify or contribute to the research on the phenomenon analyzed (e.g. productivity of educators). |  |
| Optional/General comments | Finding a more attractive title and correctly translated into English (a few suggestions have been expressed above).Adapting the Abstract to the content of the paper.Major improvements of the English language are needed (relevant examples can be found above).Increasing the scientific level of the chapter.Enriching and updating the list of references. |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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