

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_87271
Title of the Manuscript:	Reading Modules Using Marungko Approach of Grade One Pupils in the Elementary Schools of Zambales, Philippines
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://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>To protect anonymity and confidentiality, assign a pseudonym to the school which is the study. Still give a competent demographic reveal.</p> <p>Give a paragraph to explain the Marungko approach to non-Philippine readers/researchers. If possible, provide a research approach.</p> <p>Did you establish validity/reliability of your instrument? Suitability to a pupil population? If not, this is a major limitation. Under 3.1.5 typo first sentence bools should be books.</p> <p>What is Bawal Pang Lumabas? Explain</p> <p>At the beginning of methodology, you stated you explored causation. This is not a correct assumption. A t test does not prove causation; one can infer a mean difference and correlation. Please correct this. Rejecting the or failing to reject the null hypothesis is a difference.</p> <p>Baseline problem: Maybe I missed it. Was the preassessment between the two groups within 0.25 SD of each other? If not, the groups are significantly different and either a correction should be used or a significant limitation reported. Your means in your t tests suggests the groups were initially very different (e.g., only two groups with comparable initial scores could be adequately compared; the control group started out much weaker, making any comparison difficult to assess).</p> <p>Was there any attrition?</p> <p>In the reading, p values should never be reported with a leading zero or as 0. If a computer reports .0000, you should report <.001 or something similar (wrong is 0.000 or .0000).</p> <p>You give a lot of information after Table 3. That information should be moved to the discussion.</p> <p>Why didn't you compare the groups against each other instead of separately?</p> <p>Add a significant limitations section, as outlined above. The major problem is the baseline is significantly different <i>before</i> your analysis. Hence, your major finding in #5 of the conclusion is not supported by your research. It might or might not be true.</p> <p>Significant limitation: Without a correction, you conduct so many t tests, significant likelihood of Type 1 error in your subgroup analysis. Confidence intervals and power analysis would show this, and SPSS can run this analysis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA