

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_103752
Title of the Manuscript:	A Structural Relationship Model in the 21st Century Teaching and Learning of Filipino Teachers
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript focuses on actual questions about the teaching and learning of Filipino teachers. After a theoretical introduction, the manuscript shows research with novel results.</p> <p>2. I suggest that the title contains the term "ICT" or "ICT integration" too. Rationale: ICT integration is the first keyword and ICT is a very common word in this manuscript (ICT appears 64 times in the manuscript).</p> <p>3. The abstract summarizes the text sufficiently and orients the reader well.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well structured.</p> <p>5. In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. The 18 references in this manuscript are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggestion 1: Although ICT is a well-known acronym for information and communication technology these days, I recommend that the meaning of ICT be clarified in the abstract and in the text immediately upon its first use. Currently, the acronym ICT appears 12 times in the abstract and in the text, before it is resolved at the bottom of the 2nd page.</p> <p>Suggestion 2: In the cases of Table 1-4, the column of Mean lets be before the column of SD.</p> <p>Suggestion 3: We can not find referring to Chart 1 in the text. Suggestion: be referring to it in the text. But: Chart 1 includes a table, so it is not a chart, but a table. So, it will be Table 1, if the Author rennumbers the tables in the text and the titles of the tables.</p> <p>Suggestion 4: under the figures and tables 5-7, be readable the meaning of abbreviations of variables.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ferenc Mező
Department, University & Country	Institute of Psychology, Eszterházy Károly Catholic University, Hungary