



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Administrative Support and Professional Compliance in Reading Instruction among Public Elementary School Teachers
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

After evaluating your manuscript alongside the peer reviewers' feedback, I find your quantitative study on school leadership and literacy instruction to be robust, though it requires greater empirical and contextual precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify Davao Oriental as the research locale and specify that the study involved public elementary school teachers. Furthermore, your summary must clearly delineate the key predictive factors, specifically relational trust, mentorship, and public support while noting that both main variables were rated as "very extensive" by the participants. In your methodology, please also ensure you explicitly state the use of high-reliability Likert-scale instruments for data collection to strengthen your research design.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Your abstract currently lacks a detailed breakdown of the specific domains that significantly predict instructional compliance. Please explicitly list relational trust, mentorship, and public support as the key predictive factors in your summary. Furthermore, you must specify the exact geographic context of your respondents directly in the abstract to ground the demographic data. Ensure you mention that the data were collected from public elementary school teachers in Davao Oriental. In your methodology section, explicitly state that you utilized high-reliability Likert-scale instruments for data collection. Finally, clearly note that the overall levels for both main variables were rated as very extensive by the participants. These precise inclusions will thoroughly fortify your methodological transparency.

General Comments and Recommendations

This quantitative study provides a robust examination of how school leadership influences literacy instruction. The theoretical framework effectively grounds the correlational analysis, but the abstract needs a more explicit delineation of the specific predictive variables. Clarifying these elements will provide readers with a much stronger grasp of your empirical findings. Implementing these targeted revisions will ensure your research makes a definitive impact.



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>
The abstract lacks the exact predictor variables right now. You must write relational trust, mentorship, and public support inside the text. Also, tell the readers the exact location of the research. State that the work happened in Davao Oriental. Next, list the exact scale type in the method section. Add the use of Likert scales to the paragraph. The public will appreciate these specific facts when they review the document.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read the article about head teacher help and teacher rule obedience. The text holds great value for school administrators everywhere. You need to put exact facts in the summary so people understand the research fast. Please apply my advice to perfect the document.

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.			