



Reviewer Report

Manuscript Title:	Elementary Practice Teachers' Preparedness and Institutional Support in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

The paper is timely and relevant because the MATATAG Curriculum is still a major concern in Philippine basic education, and the focus on practice teachers is useful. The manuscript is generally clear, and the topic has value for teacher education institutions. However, one major area that needs strengthening is the research instrument and measurement quality, because the whole findings depend mainly on a researcher-made questionnaire, but the paper does not yet give enough evidence that the tool can validly and reliably measure "preparedness" and "institutional support"

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The manuscript mentioned that the instrument was reviewed by experts and that Cronbach's alpha was used, but it did not present the number and qualifications of validators, the validation process, the actual reliability values per scale, and how the rating interpretation was constructed. This is important because the conclusions are based on mean scores such as "Prepared," "Very Prepared," "Needed," and "Highly Needed." Without clearer evidence that the



instrument was valid and internally consistent, the reader may find it difficult to fully trust whether the reported preparedness and support needs truly reflect the respondents' actual condition. I suggest that the author add a more detailed explanation of how the questionnaire items were developed, how content validity was checked, what revisions were made after validation, the Cronbach's alpha result for each section, and the exact basis for the verbal interpretation ranges. This will make the methodology stronger and will also make the results more credible.

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.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The topic is very timely and highly relevant to the current educational landscape in the country, given the ongoing rollout of the MATATAG curriculum. Looking into the preparedness of our pre-service teachers is a commendable initiative, as they are the next in line to the profession.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study relies heavily on a researcher-made questionnaire and mentions that reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's alpha. However, the actual Cronbach's alpha coefficient value is completely missing from the text. Kindly provide the exact values to prove the instrument's internal consistency. In your data analysis, you only utilized frequency, percentage, and weighted mean. Reporting mean scores without the Standard Deviation (SD) in your tables (Tables 3 to 8) is a major statistical flaw. The SD is critical to show the dispersion or variance of the respondents' answers.
The study is too purely descriptive. You have demographic data showing respondents from two distinct programs: Bachelor of Early Childhood Education and Bachelor of Elementary Education. It is highly recommended to run inferential statistics (e.g., t-test or Mann-Whitney U test) to determine if there is a significant difference in the preparedness or perceived need for institutional support between these two groups. This will elevate your paper from merely describing the data to drawing more meaningful academic conclusions and strengthening the analytical rigor of the study.
The research utilized a total enumeration of 87 practice teachers from a single campus (Pangasinan State University - Bayambang Campus). While total enumeration is acceptable for small populations, drawing broad, generalized conclusions about the MATATAG curriculum transition based on a localized, single-institution sample of 87 students is a stretch. The conclusion should explicitly state the limitations of the sample size and caution against generalizing the findings to all practice teachers in the Philippines.



The quality of your citations matters heavily. I noted several citations from 2025 that link to Zenodo uploads or seemingly non-peer-reviewed repositories (e.g., Barroga, 2025; Labora, 2025). Please replace these with established, peer-reviewed literature. Relying on preprints or unvetted local uploads weakens the theoretical foundation of your discussion.

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.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			