

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_101690
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural Model on Teaching Competences of Filipino Teachers in Secondary
Type of the 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/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>1. the authors present an analysis on Teaching Skills of Filipino Teachers in Secondary duly supported by robust statistical instruments. In this sense, it is believed that the research is relevant and presents a contribution to the scientific debate on the subject.</p> <p>2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes</p> <p>Authors need to check the formatting of some citations that do not seem to follow the established pattern. Also, the introduction section seems too extensive. Some information (detailed in the attached corrected file) present in the results section would be better presented in the method section.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Overall, the article is relevant, and makes use of robust and adequate methodological instruments, presenting important contributions to the scientific debate. Only punctual corrections were suggested to improve the work. Thus, acceptance of the article is recommended, as long as these observations are corrected.	

### 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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arthur Felipe Echs Lucena</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>State University of Londrina, Brazil</b>