



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Three-Term School Calendar of the Department of Education (DepEd): What Lies Beneath the Reorganization?
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
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

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses a relevant education policy issue and offers a critical perspective on the three-term school calendar. Its main value is the attempt to connect policy reform with power, teacher workload, and material conditions.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The methodology needs to be clearer. The paper says it uses a Gramscian theoretical design, but it does not explain how policy documents, news reports, and other sources were selected and analyzed. This matters because the reader needs to see how the conclusions were reached.
Several strong claims about budget cuts, teacher opposition, undelivered ICT materials, and student-to-computer ratio need stronger evidence. These claims are central to the argument, so they should be supported with direct and reliable sources.



The use of Gramscian concepts is interesting, but some terms seem applied too broadly. The paper should explain more carefully how concepts such as hegemony, passive revolution, and subaltern position directly fit the DepEd calendar reform.

The Southeast Asian comparison is useful, but it needs more balanced evidence. The discussion sometimes presents Vietnam, Thailand, and Indonesia as stronger systems without enough data to support the comparison.

The paper's argument sometimes becomes repetitive and too forceful. Some parts repeat the same idea that the calendar reform hides deeper problems. A more focused discussion will make the critique stronger.

The conclusion makes valid points, but it should connect more directly to the evidence presented in the paper. It should avoid making broader claims that were not fully demonstrated in the analysis.

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>
Overall, this is a very brave and interesting topic. Using Gramsci's philosophy to look at the Department of Education's school calendar is a fresh angle. You make a strong central point - changing the calendar is a "Passive Revolution" that hides the real physical and financial problems of the schools.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract and Introduction 1. The abstract is quite long and has too much heavy vocabulary right at the start. Try to make the first few sentences simpler so the reader knows exactly what your paper is about without getting dizzy. 2. In the Introduction, there is a big sentence structure problem here: "While this is not a trimester system in the university sense - as it maintains the same subjects and curriculum because it represents a significant administrative shift by reducing the frequency of grading cycles." This sentence is broken and does not make sense. Please rewrite it clearly. 3. Table 1 and Table 2 are helpful for giving the timeline of the calendar shifts. Keep these, they are good.
Methodology I understand you are using a philosophical design without empirical data. That is perfectly fine for this type of paper. But Table 3 looks like a dictionary page. In advanced writing, we do not usually put theoretical definitions in a basic table. It is much better to remove this table and just



explain these terms (like Hegemony, Subaltern) naturally inside your text when you first use them in the discussion.

Discussion

1. The part where you compare the budgets of Secretary Duterte and Secretary Angara is excellent. The fact about the 12,022 undelivered laptops makes your Gramscian argument very real and strong. Expand on this a little more if you can.
2. Your comparison with Vietnam, Thailand, and Indonesia is a nice touch to give regional context. But Table 4 is too simple. Everything in that table is already explained well in your paragraphs. You can delete the table to save space.
3. Please check this sentence: "Further argues that it is at the institutional friction that stalls progress, yet its analytical lens remains frustratingly narrow and diagnoses where the reform stands...". Who is arguing here? The subject of the sentence is missing. It is very confusing to read.

Conclusion

Your conclusion captures your main ideas very well. But the emotion is maybe too high. For example, using the phrase "completely useless" is a bit too informal and aggressive. You can change it to something like "highly ineffective" or "pedagogically empty." We want to sound critical, but still objective.

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.			