



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Lived Experiences of Public Secondary Mathematics Teachers Using AI-Supported Instruction in the Philippines: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study
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 addresses a timely and relevant topic by exploring how public secondary mathematics teachers experience AI-supported instruction. The study has value because it gives attention to teacher judgment and classroom realities, not only the technology itself. However, the paper still needs stronger focus, clearer methodological reporting, and less repetition between the results and discussion.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The introduction gives useful background on AI in education, but the research gap is not yet clearly sharpened. The authors should explain more directly what is still unknown about mathematics teachers' lived experiences in the Philippine public school context and why a phenomenological study is needed.



The methodology needs better consistency and precision. Some parts mention Davao City while other parts refer to Mindanao, and some statements still sound like a proposal rather than a completed study. This weakens the credibility of the research process and should be corrected.

The use of Colaizzi's method should be reported in more concrete detail. The manuscript states the steps, but it does not show enough how significant statements were transformed into meanings and themes. A clearer audit trail or sample analysis process would help readers see how the findings were developed.

The results section has relevant themes, but the presentation is sometimes too general and repetitive. More direct participant evidence and deeper description of lived experience are needed, instead of relying mainly on summarized explanations after each quotation.

The discussion repeats much of the results and sometimes depends heavily on citations without enough critical interpretation. The authors should explain more clearly what the findings mean for mathematics teaching, teacher agency, and responsible AI use in resource-limited school settings.

The conclusion includes many recommendations, but some parts read like a general policy statement rather than a conclusion from the data. The authors should make it shorter and ensure that all recommendations are directly supported by the findings.

Some details need careful checking because they may affect trust in the manuscript. For example, the acknowledgment refers to "pre-service mathematics teachers," while the study participants are public secondary mathematics teachers. Such inconsistencies should be corrected before submission.

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>
The paper tackles a very timely and interesting topic. Integrating AI in math education is everywhere right now, and hearing from public school teachers is valuable. The overall flow makes sense, and the use of frameworks like TAM and TPACK in the discussion is a really smart move to ground the findings. But here is the main problem: there is a big mismatch between the "Transcendental Phenomenological" label and the actual data presented. Phenomenology is supposed to go deep into the "essence" of an experience. The results here read more like a basic qualitative survey. The quotes are just too short and lack the deep emotional or cognitive struggles you expect from this kind of design. Also, there are some glaring inconsistencies with the geographical scope that absolutely need to be fixed before this is ready for publication.



Specific Comments and Recommendations

Title and Scope Inconsistencies

The title claims the study is about the "Philippines". But then, look at the abstract - it mentions the authors are from "Davao City" and implies that context. Later in the Methodology, it explicitly says the setting involves teachers "from different schools in Davao City". But right after that, the inclusion criteria state the teachers must be employed in "Mindanao". You have to be consistent. If the sample is just from Davao City, say Davao City. Don't claim the whole country or the whole island region if the data doesn't support that wide scope.

Introduction

The intro gives a good global view of AI in education. However, the jump to the local problem is too sudden. You go straight into the Philippine context in paragraph 5 without setting up the specific local struggles first. Explain why public secondary schools in the Philippines are a unique context for AI. You talk about slow internet and lack of gadgets in the results - mention these realities earlier in the introduction to build a stronger rationale for why this study is needed.

Methodology & Research Design

You call this a "Transcendental Phenomenological Study". This specific design (usually linked to Husserl) requires "bracketing" or epoché—meaning the researchers must actively set aside their own biases. But looking at your Data Analysis and Procedure sections, there is zero mention of bracketing. If you used Colaizzi, that's fine, but you must explain how you handled researcher bias! Watch out for simple proofreading errors. For example, you wrote "A total of eight (8) participants were be selected...". Fix "were be". You mention the in-depth interviews lasted 40-50 minutes. That's an okay length, but honestly, it might be a bit short for deep phenomenological extraction, which explains why the quotes are thin.

Results

The quotes you chose to represent the themes are way too basic. Look at this one: "I use AI as support, not as something that replaces what a teacher does.". Or another one: "AI makes lessons more engaging.". These statements do not show the "lived experience" in a rich, transcendental way. They just state obvious facts. Where is the thick description? How did it feel when the AI gave a wrong math formula? What was the exact tension in the classroom when the internet failed? Go back to the interview transcripts. Pull out longer, more descriptive quotes that show the struggle, the surprise, or the complexity of using AI in a resource-poor public school setting. Table 1 is neatly organized, but the text needs much more depth to justify the phenomenology label.

Discussion and Conclusion

The connection to TAM and TPACK is strong; it anchors your findings well to existing literature. But the conclusion repeats the results too much. A conclusion should synthesize the bigger picture, not just summarize what you already said. You give recommendations to educational policymakers. What exactly should they do? "Establish clear policies" is very vague. Be specific based on your findings like suggesting offline AI alternatives or specific infrastructure investments since the internet is heavily unstable.



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.			