



## REVIEWER REPORT

<b>Manuscript Title:</b>	Structure Learning Capacity and Accommodative Presentation of Public Elementary School Teachers
<b>Type of Article:</b>	Original Article

### FIRST ROUND

#### EDITOR

#### Comments and Recommendations

I find your quantitative correlational study to be methodologically rigorous, though it requires greater empirical and contextual precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly identify the Compostela East District in Davao de Oro as the research locale and specify that the predictors collectively account for 52.3% of the variance in DV. Furthermore, your summary must be expanded to clearly delineate the specific sub-domains of IV that served as significant predictors notably systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer while also mentioning that participants demonstrated "highly extensive" levels for both main variables.

#### REVIEWER 1

#### Specific Comments and Recommendations

Please enhance your abstract by explicitly stating the specific geographic location where the research was conducted to provide immediate demographic context. You must ensure that Compostela East District, Davao de Oro, Philippines is clearly identified in the summary. Furthermore, you need to explicitly list the specific sub domains of structure learning capacity that serve as significant predictors in your regression model. Make sure to mention systems perspective, openness and experimentation, and knowledge transfer directly within the text. Additionally, clarify the exact predictive power of your combined model to demonstrate analytical depth. State explicitly that the predictors collectively accounted for 52.3 percent of the variance in accommodative presentation. Incorporating these precise details will thoroughly fortify your empirical summary and demonstrate the rigorous nature of your quantitative analysis.

#### General Comments and Recommendations

This quantitative correlational study provides a methodologically rigorous and timely examination of how organizational capacities influence adaptive teacher performance. The theoretical framework appears robust, yet the initial manuscript requires a much more explicit articulation of the specific regression outcomes in the abstract to meet top academic standards. Clarifying the precise variance explained by your statistical model will significantly elevate the empirical transparency of your summary. Implementing these comprehensive revisions will firmly establish your research as a substantive contribution to educational leadership literature.



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 write the exact variance percentage inside the abstract. State clearly that the model explains 52.3 percent of the variance. Also, tell the readers the exact location of the study. Add Compostela East District and Davao de Oro to the summary paragraph. Next, list the exact predictor variables in the text. Write that systems perspective and knowledge transfer predict the outcomes. Finally, state that teachers show highly extensive levels for both main variables.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read the paper about structure learning capacity and accommodative presentation. The topic holds massive importance for school administrators today. The paper lacks exact facts and numbers in the summary section. You must add specific details to make the research complete.

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**

<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.			