

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_127426
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNICATION CAPACITIES AND MUTUAL CONNECTION SYSTEM OF TEACHERS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it sheds light on the critical interplay between teachers' communication capacities and their mutual connection systems, both of which are essential for fostering effective collaboration and enhancing educational environments. By providing empirical evidence of these relationships, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how interpersonal skills influence professional networks, benefiting not only educators but also students and school systems at large. The research findings also offer practical insights for policymakers and educational leaders, emphasizing the need to prioritize communication training as a tool for improving teacher effectiveness and cohesion.</p> <p>I appreciate this manuscript for its clear focus on an important yet often overlooked aspect of education: the relational dynamics among teachers. However, the manuscript could benefit from more nuanced discussions of the broader implications for student learning outcomes and school culture. Overall, it provides a solid foundation for further research in this area.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested title: The Impact of Teachers' Communication Capacities on Professional Collaboration in Public Elementary Schools"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Emphasize the Research Gap: The abstract does not mention the specific gap this study addresses in the existing literature. Adding a sentence about why this research is significant would strengthen its introduction.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its clear research design, appropriate use of statistical methods, and well-defined variables. The use of a non-experimental quantitative approach with a correlational design is suitable for examining the relationship between communication capabilities and mutual connection systems among teachers. The selection of statistical tools, such as the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and regression analysis, is appropriate for analyzing the strength and significance of the relationships between the variables. Furthermore, the study's comprehensive methodology, including a universal sampling method and clear presentation of findings, ensures the reliability and validity of the results. Overall, the manuscript adheres to standard scientific practices, making it a technically sound contribution to the field of educational research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references included in the manuscript are fairly comprehensive and cover key areas related to teacher development, communication, and collaboration. However, there is a need for more recent references to ensure the study is grounded in current research trends. For instance, some references like Bandura (1977) and Cook & Emerson (1987) are foundational but quite dated, and could be supplemented with more recent research in	

Review Form 3

	<p>social learning theory, communication in educational settings, and teacher collaboration models.</p> <p>Additionally, while the manuscript references studies on teacher collaboration (e.g., Vangrieken et al., 2015), and professional development (e.g., Sergiovanni, 2015), it might benefit from more recent works on digital communication tools and technology in education, as these have become increasingly relevant in the context of modern teaching environments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall professionalism. Here are a few suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency in Terminology: Some terms like "communication capacities" and "mutual connection system" are introduced clearly, but they are not always used consistently. It might be helpful to define them more clearly in the introduction and use them consistently throughout the manuscript to avoid potential confusion. Sentence Structure and Clarity: Some sentences are overly complex or could be broken down into simpler structures for better readability. For example, in the abstract: <i>"The findings revealed that the communication capabilities of public elementary school teachers—measured in terms of connections, compelling communication, stability, manners, listening, and charm—were often demonstrated."</i> This could be rewritten for clarity, e.g., "The study found that public elementary school teachers frequently demonstrated high levels of communication capabilities, such as connection, compelling communication, stability, manners, listening, and charm." Phrasing and Word Choice: In some parts, the phrasing is slightly awkward. For example: <i>"It is clinched in this study that there is a significant relationship..."</i> The word "clinched" is informal and may not fit well in scholarly writing. A more formal alternative could be "It is confirmed in this study that there is a significant relationship..." Grammar and Syntax: Minor grammatical errors, such as subject-verb agreement and punctuation, appear throughout the manuscript. For instance, in the conclusion: <i>"It is concluded in this study that the domains of communication capacities is significantly influence to mutual connection system of public elementary school teachers."</i> This could be corrected to: "It is concluded in this study that the domains of communication capacities significantly influence the mutual connection system of public elementary school teachers." Transition Between Ideas: Some sections could benefit from smoother transitions between different points. For example, after discussing the findings in the results section, a brief transitional statement connecting these results to the broader implications would improve the flow of the article. <p>Overall, the manuscript communicates the ideas well but could be improved with some attention to detail in grammar, clarity, and academic tone. Editing for these aspects will help elevate the scholarly quality of the writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>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>Antonius Denny Firmanto</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat Teologi Widya Sasana, Indonesia</p>