



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Multidisciplinary Teaching Strategies and Cultural Responsiveness of Teachers in Public Elementary School
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

The correlation reported ($r=0.860$) is extremely high, bordering on singularity. This suggests that the two instruments (Multidisciplinary Strategies and Cultural Responsiveness) likely measure the same underlying "Good Teaching" factor (Halo Effect). The manuscript lacks discriminant validity evidence.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Provide missing details on response rate and handling of missing data.

Report assumption checks for Pearson correlation and linear regression (normality, linearity, outliers).

Clarify the basis for descriptive labels ("high," "moderate") and justify cut-points.

Provide confidence intervals for effect sizes, not only p-values.

Ensure tables label constructs consistently and correct any domain naming ambiguities.

General Comments and Recommendations

This is a standard correlational survey study with self-report measures and very large reported associations. The magnitude of correlation and R^2 raises concerns about common-method variance, construct overlap, and potential scoring/analysis errors.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.



	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>The "Learning Connections" domain scored significantly lower (Moderate) than others. Provide a specific discussion on why this "application" phase is lagging compared to "understanding."</p> <p>Define "multidisciplinary" versus "interdisciplinary" in the context of the Philippine curriculum (K-12).</p> <p>Clarify if the teachers are generalists (teaching all subjects) or specialists. This affects the feasibility of multidisciplinary strategies.</p>

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>The correlation of 0.860 suggests that "Multidisciplinary Teaching" and "Cultural Responsiveness" may not be distinct constructs in the minds of the respondents. The authors should perform a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to test whether a one-factor model fits the data better than a two-factor model. Without this, the regression results are likely an artifact of collinearity. The regression model is suspiciously perfect for social science research. This magnitude of explained variance typically indicates redundancy between the independent and dependent variables. The authors must scrutinize the survey items for overlapping content (e.g., items in both scales asking about "connecting to student lives"). The mechanism linking "disciplinary understanding" to "cultural responsiveness" is underdeveloped. The authors argue that integration leads to responsiveness, but the reverse is equally plausible (culturally responsive teachers seek multidisciplinary tools). Cross-sectional data cannot resolve this; the language regarding prediction must be softened.</p>

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			