



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Educational Philosophy and Instructional Practices of English Language Teachers in Public Secondary Schools
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

Your study on pedagogical beliefs and instructional methods offers a timely examination of language education, though it requires greater empirical and contextual precision. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify the Paquibato District of Davao City as the research locale and provide a complete breakdown of the philosophical domains assessed, ranging from essentialism to existentialism. Furthermore, your summary must clearly highlight that existentialism emerged as the most prominent belief while ICT integration was identified as the highest instructional priority.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Your abstract currently omits the complete list of philosophical domains assessed by your survey. Please explicitly list essentialism, perennialism, progressivism, social reconstructivism, and existentialism to provide a complete overview. In the results section of the abstract, you should detail the exact philosophy that ranked highest. State explicitly that existentialism emerged as the most prominent philosophy, while progressivism was the least. Furthermore, specify which instructional practice received the highest priority from the educators. Include the detail that ICT integration was prioritized most. These adjustments will greatly improve the precision of your empirical summary.

General Comments and Recommendations

This descriptive-correlational study provides a timely examination of how foundational pedagogical beliefs translate into modern instructional methods for language educators. The statistical analysis is clear, but the manuscript requires a more explicit statement of the specific philosophical domains measured in the abstract. Highlighting the most prominent philosophy and practice will also help readers immediately grasp the core empirical takeaways. These refinements will ensure your research is both comprehensive and transparent.



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

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
You must put the exact location inside the abstract. State clearly that the educators work in Paquibato District of Davao City. Also, the summary needs the exact top philosophy. Tell the audience that existentialism is the most prominent belief. Finally, list the exact top practice in the abstract to make it complete. Add that ICT integration received the highest priority. The public will appreciate these specific facts when they read the document.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read your paper about educator beliefs with much interest. The text has very good points but it lacks some exact facts. Readers need to see the exact names to comprehend the work completely. Please add the details I mention below to perfect the manuscript.

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.			