



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Feedback Seeking and Teaching Standards Capabilities of Public Secondary Technology and Livelihood Education Teachers
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

<u>Comments and Recommendations</u>
Your empirical findings are strong, but the reviewers require explicit mention of reliability scores and participant demographics in the abstract. Update the manuscript to reflect these methodological specifics.

REVIEWER 1

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Please enhance your abstract by explicitly stating the specific geographic location and the participant pool. You must ensure that Cluster 13, Division of Davao City and the 120 respondents out of a 200-teacher population are clearly identified in the summary. Furthermore, you need to explicitly list the reliability coefficients for your adapted instruments. Make sure to mention that Cronbach's alpha values were 0.920 and 0.902. Additionally, clarify the exact mean score for feedback-seeking behavior to demonstrate analytical depth. State explicitly that it obtained a very high overall mean of 4.22.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This quantitative study offers a methodologically rigorous examination of how professional feedback-seeking behaviors correlate with instructional capabilities in vocational education. The statistical framework is sound, yet the initial draft requires a much more explicit articulation of your specific instrument reliability and participant sampling within the abstract to meet top academic standards. Clarifying the exact regression outcomes will significantly elevate the empirical transparency of your summary. Implementing these comprehensive revisions will firmly establish your research as a substantive contribution to teacher professional development literature.

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>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The abstract lacks the exact location right now. You must write Cluster 13 inside the text. Also, tell the readers the exact participant count. State that 120 educators shared their answers. Next, list the exact reliability score. Add the 0.920 alpha score to the paragraph. The public will appreciate these specific facts when they review the document.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read the paper about teacher feedback and standards. The topic holds massive importance for school administrators today. The first draft 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>	
	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 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.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			