



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-50792

Date: 27/03/2025

Title: A Study on Mental Health of Prospective Teachers

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision ✓

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality				✓
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Jude Ifeanyichukwu Nnadozie**

Date: 27/03/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The article explores the mental health of prospective teachers, aiming to identify significant differences in mean mental health scores based on the locality of the institution, marital status, parental education, and family income. The findings reveal a significant difference in mental health scores concerning the institution's locality. This study makes a valuable contribution to the ongoing discourse in this field and lays a strong foundation for further research.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Below are my comments:

1. The abstract needs clearer and succinct synopsis of the study. In line 5, change “significance difference” to ‘significant difference’.
2. The objective the study reads “The objective of the study is to find the significant difference in Mental Health among prospective teachers based on locality of institution, marital status, parental education and family income”. What contribute will finding this add to knowledge? How would the finding translate to relatable significance? I suggest the author/s revise the object in line with the questions.
3. The methodology section of the study needs major restructuring for clarity. The author/s should state clear and comprehensive methodological orientation of the study, and why the choice of normative survey for the study and how it was used. What sampling method was used to select the study participants and what informed the choice of the sampling method and selection of the participants. Also, what data analysis method employed in the study. It will be important as well to highlight any methodological gap in previous studies in this area. Crosscheck and perhaps restructure this section of the study.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. The sources used in the study not sufficient enough resulting to the study not having depth and sound theoretical and conceptual background. The author/s should have assembled more relevant literature for better and richer insight and for sound theoretical/conceptual background. Also, some of the sources are over 5 years. This is not very satisfactory for a study of this nature given that there sources available in this area which the author should have drawn a lot of insight from.
5. The pages of the manuscript are not numbered. This makes reading the manuscript a bit difficult. The author/s need to consider inserting page numbers
6. Author/s should crosscheck style: page numbering, citation, (reference/bibliography) according to Author Guidelines for formatting, citing, and referencing provided by the journal.