

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_125198
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Teacher Accountability: Development and Validation of the Teacher's Professional Accountability Scale (TPAS)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
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.	The study seems to be relevant as it aims to develop and validate Teachers' Professional Accountability Scale. It serves as an important tool to determine the level of teachers' accountability. However, the actual tool is not included in the submitted manuscript to enable the reviewers and readers to better see the specific indicators validated under each dimension. Though figures were presented, the actual indicators or statements must be included in the manuscript for others to see what has been developed and validated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title is appropriate.	
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.	The Abstract should serve as an overview of the research in one paragraph. In the abstract, it was not discussed whether the tool is researcher-made, adopted/adapted, or a product of focus group discussion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Introduction lacks substance. The existing gaps from the recent data were not provided. The international, regional, local, and personal perspectives should be discussed and established to strongly justify the need to conduct the study. Recent literature published within five years should be cited. Also, the researcher must explain the purpose of the study in the Introduction.	
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.	<p>The introduction should be modified and must be written comprehensively. Though the research method was included, the researcher should include the proponent of the method or design used. It must also</p> <p>There is also no consistency with the number of respondents in the abstract (281) and the respondents listed in the Item Analysis/Item Selection (150). The researcher must also include the research locale and the sampling technique used.</p> <p>Each indicator for each domain should also be included in order for the reader and other researchers to better appreciate the study.</p> <p>The discussions in the Tables are insufficient. The implication of the study must be incorporated in the discussion.</p> <p>The Conclusion should also be improved. The researcher should specifically highlight the major contribution of the study to the academic world. If possible, a recommendation shall also be included.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not all listed in the references are actually cited in the manuscript. The references are also not recent. As a cardinal rule, the researcher must cite literature within five years to cite relevant data or information.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, however, more discussions are still needed for the study to meet the scholarly standards.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bernard Evangelicom V. Jamon
Department, University & Country	Talisay City College, Philippines