



## REVIEWER REPORT

<b>Manuscript Title:</b>	Dialogic Communication, Critical Thinking and Collaborative Problem-Solving of Public Elementary School Teachers
<b>Type of Article:</b>	Original Article

### FIRST ROUND

#### EDITOR

<u>Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study attempts to measure complex cognitive constructs (Critical Thinking, CPS) via Likert scales. This is a fundamental validity issue. Critical thinking is a performance skill, not an attitude. The finding that "Social Challenges" contributes most to the CPS score is tautological if the CPS scale is defined by social items.

#### REVIEWER 1

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Verify degrees of freedom and check for multicollinearity (VIF). Provide access to the survey items.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
Measuring "Critical Thinking" (analysis, inference, evaluation) through self-report surveys is methodologically weak. A teacher claiming they "analyze well" is not evidence of analytical skill. The authors must discuss the divergence between self-concept and actual cognitive performance, or reframe the study as measuring "Self-Efficacy in Critical Thinking."

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.



**REVIEWER 2**

<b><u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u></b>
<p>Table 5 reports a coefficient of 2.02 for Social Challenges. This unstandardized beta is unusually high relative to the scale range; please verify the data normalization.</p> <p>The sample size (N=131) relative to the number of variables in the regression needs power justification.</p> <p>Clarify the "emotional challenges" construct. Is this emotional intelligence or emotional regulation?</p>

<b><u>General Comments and Recommendations</u></b>
<p>The regression analysis finding that "Social challenges... contributed most significantly" appears tautological. If "Social challenges" is a subscale of the dependent variable (Collaborative Problem Solving), it will naturally correlate perfectly. The authors must clarify if they regressed sub-domains against the total score (which is invalid) or against a distinct external criterion. The "Dialogic Communication" variable needs better definition. Is this referring to classroom dialogue (teacher-student) or professional dialogue (teacher-teacher)? The distinction is crucial for the link to Collaborative Problem Solving.</p>

**Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.**

<b><u>Decision</u></b>	
<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**

<b><u>Decision</u></b>	<b><u>Editor</u></b>	<b><u>Reviewer 1</u></b>	<b><u>Reviewer 2</u></b>
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.			