

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_103752</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Structural Relationship Model in the 21st Century Teaching and Learning of Filipino Teachers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript offers valuable insights into factors impacting 21<sup>st</sup>-century education, highlighting the significance of ICT integration, classroom management, and professional identity. These insights are crucial for teacher educators, school leaders, and policymakers aiming to enhance modern education.</p> <p>It is OK</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Basically. Text like "according to Gill" should be considered to be either explained or referenced. Page 6, the first paragraph shows a numbering error. There are several further inconsistencies in the document, we recommend revision!</p> <p>The number and type of references chosen seems sufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p> <p>2. Translation of figures</p>	<p>It is basically OK. "Relayability" is consequently misspelt, maybe final proofreading makes sense. There is no consistent use of the tenses.</p> <p>We recommend the translation of the figures into English as well as adding an explanation of the used abbreviations (Example: Fig. 1: Conceptual framework of the study)</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Peter Mazohl</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>European Foundation for Quality in Blended Learning, Austria</b>