

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_126580
Title of the Manuscript:	Instructional Practices and Self-Efficacy of Teachers in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Antique, Philippines
Type of the Article	Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides insight into the instructional practices and self-efficacy of public elementary teachers, adding to the body of knowledge in educational research and psychology. By examining relationships between teachers' instructional approaches and their confidence in managing behaviors, motivating students, and handling non-teaching tasks, the study highlights areas crucial for teacher development and student outcomes. I appreciate this manuscript for its methodical approach and its potential to inform policy decisions aimed at improving teacher training programs. However, the study could be strengthened by including more diverse samples and contextual details to enhance the generalizability and depth of its findings.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	yes	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is generally comprehensive, covering the purpose, methodology, key findings, and implications of the study. However, a few adjustments could improve clarity and emphasis on essential points:	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The structure and subsections of the manuscript appear generally appropriate, as it covers the essential areas typical for a descriptive-correlation study.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor by employing a descriptive-correlational design, which is suitable for exploring relationships between instructional practices and self-efficacy without inferring causation. The use of validated and reliability-tested questionnaires enhances the robustness of the findings, as this ensures that the instruments accurately measure the intended constructs.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	Include recent studies (from the past five years) on instructional practices and self-efficacy among teachers, preferably focusing on public school settings or similar demographics	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it maintains an academic tone and uses field-appropriate terminology	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Use of precise terms would enhance the readability, especially in the abstract and methodology sections. Clearly distinguishing terms like "instructional practices" and "self-efficacy" in specific contexts.</li><li>2. Ensure consistency in terminology for concepts like "instructional practices" and "self-efficacy" throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion.</li><li>3. Check for any minor grammatical issues or awkward phrasing to ensure smooth flow and clarity.</li></ol>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tehseen Tahir</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Hyderabad, India</b>