



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Navigating the Balance: Teachers' Experiences in Meeting Curriculum Demands and Providing Individualized Support for Students in DepEd Schools
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

<u>Comments and Recommendations</u>
Your study on the tensions between curriculum standards and inclusive practices is highly relevant, though it requires greater methodological and contextual precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify the Tibungco District in Davao City as the research locale and clearly list specific teacher challenges, such as curriculum rigidity and limited resources. Furthermore, your methodology and ethics sections must be expanded to report the exact participant pool size, the three-year professional experience threshold, and the specific adherence to the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

REVIEWER 1

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Please enhance the methodology section by detailing the exact size of your participant pool. You need to state that the ten participants were recruited from a pool of seventeen public elementary teachers. Also, explicitly mention the experience threshold for inclusion in your study. State clearly that participants needed at least three years of professional experience. In your abstract, be sure to specify the geographical context of your participants. Include the detail that these teachers work in Davao City, Philippines. These inclusions will help readers accurately evaluate the scope of your findings.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This study effectively tackles the pervasive tension between standardized curriculum coverage and inclusive educational practices in public classrooms. While the narrative is compelling, the methodology requires tighter specifications regarding your participant selection pool and inclusion criteria. Furthermore, the abstract should explicitly identify the location of the study to ground the context immediately. Addressing these minor omissions will significantly elevate the clarity of your methodological framework.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</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.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The text needs the exact name of the privacy law. You must mention the Data Privacy Act of 2012 inside the ethics section. Also, tell the readers the specific district. Add Tibungco District to the final manuscript. The abstract also requires more specific words about teacher challenges. State that educators face curriculum rigidity and limited resources. These exact words will make the summary complete.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The article about teacher stress and curriculum rules is very relevant. The method part lacks specific numbers right now. Readers need exact facts to trust the research. Please follow my advice to perfect the document.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</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.



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.			