

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_120741
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation Of Catch-Up Fridays: A Case Study on Teachers' Experiences at the Davao Del Norte Division
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript provide information about the teacher perspectives' on implementations and highlight some common implementation issues. The information will hopefully guide further implementation in schools in the Philippines and internationally. The manuscript uses suitable accessible academic language. However, more information need to be added to the manuscript to be convincing. See information and suggestions below.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>I would suggest adding information regarding the results, such as the themes found.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The author needs to describe how regular language teaching is structured and critically assess the reasons behind the high number of ten-year-olds with low reading skills (both 70% and 90%). With this high number of low-skill readers, the argument for a program focusing on individualisation seems odd. Would it not make sense to improve universal language teaching at the school/region/country? This needs to be addressed, and the choices must be argued for (or against).</p> <p>Related to this, the choice of using Gardener's multiple intelligences and using it to argue for learning styles needs to be defended further. The relationship between MI and learning style is not direct, and the use of learning style teaching has been questioned for years. The author needs to argue for the lens of learning styles and provide information about the positives and negatives when trying to adapt education to different learning styles. Again, if the poor reading rate is above 50% of the students, I do not believe in the argument that the teaching does not fit 70-90% of the student's learning styles; I would believe that the general literacy and language education lacks efficacy.</p> <p>I would encourage the author to reconsider the many theories used for the "theoretical lens" or relate to the theories of Fullan and Pfeffer and Salancik as implementation theories. I cannot see all theories in the discussion of the results. Revise to ensure that all theories presented are relevant.</p> <p>The program was initiated in January 2024. The participants were teachers implementing the program. The author needs to state when the data was collected and how long the teachers had been implementing the program at the time of the data collection. Previous studies suggest that implementation takes time and that the obstacles that may be found in this manuscript are due to the yearly testing.</p> <p>The introduction of the program and the training of the teachers need to be further described. The program content (Friday activities), the teacher outcomes (subject knowledge and collaboration) and what the teachers expressed and communicated during the introduction do not line up. As implementation is a large part of this study and is in the title of the manuscript, implementation research papers need to be used to build the arguments and analyse the results.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references are reasonable, but there are many other articles discussing these complex issues. There need to be added more sources to be convincing. When adding information about the implementation process the author could benefit from reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durlak, J. A., and DuPre, E. P. (2008) Implementation Matters: A Review of Research on the Influence of Implementation on Program Outcomes and the Factors Affecting Implementation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41, 237-350 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0 • Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., and Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Lisa Fohlin</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Stockholm University, Sweden</p>