



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Solar Power in the Philippine Science Curriculum: A Qualitative Curriculum Analysis
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 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 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 presents an evaluation of solar power concepts in the Republic of the Philippines basic education structure. While the subject holds relevance for global sustainable development, the execution demands strict revisions to meet academic quality assurance benchmarks. As advocates for outcomes based education, we must ensure curriculum assessments translate into measurable skills rather than superficial observations.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title • The title repeats the word curriculum unnecessarily. • Remove the second instance to ensure conciseness.
Abstract • The first and second sentences reiterate the exact same thought about the global transition to sustainable development. • Consolidate these redundant statements. • State specific thematic results rather than vague summaries of environmental awareness.



Introduction
• The text delays the local context until much later. • Introduce the Department of Energy goals earlier to establish local relevance. • Elaborate on the MATATAG curriculum framework earlier to anchor the rationale. • The transition between global concepts and local policies feels disjointed.
Methodology
• The study period is listed as October 2025 to December 2025. • Verify these dates for accuracy. • Detail the exact criteria used for the thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke. • The current description lacks the precision required for replicable qualitative research.
Results
• Table 1 presents superficial data. • Provide robust excerpts from the curriculum to support the identified themes. • Theme 2 and Theme 3 labels contain capitalization inconsistencies. • Ensure uniformity across all theme titles. • The analysis of fragmented vertical progression requires more concrete examples.
Discussion
• This section merely restates the results rather than elevates the theoretical discourse. • Connect the curriculum gaps directly to potential student competency deficits. • Discuss how the fragmented progression impacts institutional global competitiveness.
Conclusion
• The conclusion ends abruptly. • Formulate precise data driven recommendations for educational policymakers. • Specify how to bridge the gap between environmental advocacy and technical skills.
Acknowledgment
• The tone is far too informal for a scholarly journal. • Delete the final exclamation mark and colloquial gratitude. • Maintain a professional academic voice.
Conflict of Interest Statement
• The declaration is standard and clear.
References
• Inspect publication years closely. • The Tang et al reference lists the year 2026. • Verify if this is an advance publication or a typographical error.

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 deals with a timely topic and there is potential value in examining how solar power is represented in Philippine basic education.	
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>	
The documentary corpus is not sufficiently defensible for the broad claims being made. The study states that documents were purposively selected because they contained evidence related to solar power, while at the same time the paper makes conclusions about gaps, weak integration, and progression across the Philippine curriculum. This creates a serious selection problem. If documents were included partly because solar-related evidence was already found in them, the analysis cannot strongly establish where solar power is absent or inadequately represented across the wider curriculum. I also noticed inconsistency in the actual scope: the method refers mainly to Grades 7–12, but the discussion later refers to elementary levels and even TVL/PV installation. Because of this, I am not fully convinced what exact curriculum corpus the four themes are representing.	
There is a major risk that solar-specific meanings are being imposed on curriculum statements that are only generally about renewable energy. The method classifies not only explicit solar references but also broad concepts such as renewable energy, electricity, sustainability, climate change, and environmental protection as indirect representation of solar power. This becomes problematic because several findings are then stated specifically about solar power, including its benefits, limitations, values framing, and progression, even when the source competency itself may only discuss renewable energy generally. For example, the Grade 10 entries are largely about renewable energies and climate change, yet the interpretation is already made specifically toward solar power. This weakens the conceptual validity of the analysis because evidence about renewable energy as a category is not automatically evidence about solar power as a distinct technology. At present, some of the main themes may reflect the analytical assumption of the researcher more than what is actually explicit in the curriculum.	

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.			