

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_128215 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | RESTORATION LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND COLLEGIAL MODEL OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is complete and has all the elements to sound scholarly. However, implications were not clearly stated specifically in the findings. The conclusion is just a rehash of the findings. It needs improvement and should answer three questions AFTER KNOWING THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY, WHAT CAN YOU SAY ABOUT IT? Restating the findings in the conclusion section makes the paper less appealing. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is appropriate for scientific community. It has all the necessary elements that makes the research title scholarly. Moreover, it does not exceed the required number of words in a research title. | |
| 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 is good. However, the number of keywords must reach at least 5 terminologies. Also, the proposed program is not present. It has to occupy the last statement of the abstract and it should be based on the findings of the study. Moreover, the proposed program must address the most pressing issue arising from the results. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically correct but there has to be some revisions to be made like the abstract, implications of the findings, and conclusions. The author also needs to review the sampling technique because certain requirements or characteristics were identified prior to the selection of respondents. There, universal sampling may not be appropriate. What's appropriate is purposive sampling. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references may have failed to follow the APA 7 th edition. If the researcher relied on online sources, links must be provided unless the researcher got all the related literature and studies from physical journals. Noticeably, some cited sources are somehow outdated with indicated years 2018, 2016, 1995, 1998, 2017 etc. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language used in the study is appropriate. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The study is very promising. It needs revisions in some sections to make it more scientifically appealing. In the recommendation section, aside from citing what the beneficiaries must do, the author also needs to explain why will they do it and how will they do it. Recommendations must be complete and should not leave anything hanging or else it will defeat its own purpose. | |

Review Form 3

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: | Helmer B. Montejo |
| Department, University & Country | Talisay City College, Philippines |