

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>It is a contribution that makes sense in the local community. From the reviewer's point of view, it is problematic to transfer it in other settings or cultural context.</p> <p>The title of the article, "Determination of the Best Fit Model of Teaching Competences of Filipino Teachers in Secondary," is accurate and informative.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and well-written. It provides a clear and concise overview of the study, including the purpose of the study, the methods used, the results of the study, and the implications of the study.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is divided into sections that correspond to the different parts of the study, and the flow of the manuscript is logical and easy to follow.</p> <p>The manuscript is seemingly scientifically correct - as far as can be verified. The authors have used a sound research methodology and have reported their findings in a clear and objective manner. The findings of the study are consistent with the existing literature on teaching competence.</p> <p>The paper has sufficient references, which are definitely from the current period. Some of them refer strongly to the local area and are not known in Europe (or cannot be understood in full due to the language).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article is good. The authors have written the manuscript in clear and fluent English. There are a few minor errors in grammar and spelling, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Graphic "Conceptual framework of the study" must be translated and the abbreviations explained – otherwise it does not make sense.</p> <p>It is not clear why "3.3 Level of Professional Competencies of Filipino Teachers in Secondary" uses a table to create two columns.</p> <p>The formatting of the reviewed document is poor and must be revised.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Peter Mazohl
Department, University & Country	Austria