

# Review of: "Effects of Teachers' Professional Development on Students' Academic Achievement"

Aloysius Rukundo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mbarara University of Science and Technology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a nice study that underscores the role of teacher professional development in enhancing classroom learning. Indeed, "nations are because teachers are", and there is no education system that can be smarter than its own teachers. The author is commended for selecting such a visionary study. However, a number of issues may need attention that could improve the overall readability of the paper.

The narrative of the Background is fairly written. However, there is a tendency of writing long sentences that are not clear. It should have been necessary that sentences are shorter and clear. Often times, the use of joining word "and" combines two sentences with completely different ideas into one unclear sentence.

Citations in text use "&" and "and" interchangeably. Consistency in using one form is necessary.

When referring to the text in a previous paragraph, please be specific enough for the reader to connect the texts accordingly. In the opening sentence of the third paragraph of the Introduction that reads "Prior attempts to address this led stakeholders in the African..." for example, what does "this" imply in that case?

One-sentence paragraphs in most cases do not deliver the intended message. Try to avoid them.

In Introduction is generally longer than necessary with incoherent paragraphs. As a result, the "story" in that section is not elegantly told. It should have been better if the bridging between paragraphs was solid to ensure smooth flow of the text therein.

The problem statement at the moment appears like mere opinion as it has not been supported with relevant literature or evidence to verify the claims.

Description of the Sample and sampling technique would have been more concrete if it was aided by the formulae ( $Q$ ,  $O_2$ ,  $O_3$ ,  $O_4$ ,  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ) set immediately before that section. The formula in any case loses value if not integrated in text.

Description of the scores in Data Collection section should be more elaborate – what kind of tests for example were used to get the scores? What attributes or learning outcomes did the tests measure? How valid and reliable were tests? Who set the tests and using what criteria? Were the tests about achievement in a specific subject or they measured general achievement? Also the author needs to give a brief description of the education system in Nigeria for a reader to understand the context in which the testing was done.

The Hypothesis below Table 1 that states: "There is no significant difference in the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group" seems to have been stated in error, as the corresponding text talks about difference in "pretest scores of the treatment and control groups". The hypotheses set earlier in previous sections could be verified as well.

It is not clear why the author decides to compare pretest scores of the control group and posttest scores of the experimental group. Why not compare posttest scores of the experimental and control groups, as it was done for pretest comparison in Table 1?

The Discussion of results could be linked to more literature. The conclusion does not connect to the results of the study. It needs to flow from the major results. Generally the study is interesting!