



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Assessing The Impact of TPACK-Aligned Digital Materials on Pupils' Engagement in Lutayan District II
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 addresses a relevant educational issue, but there is a serious methodological problem in how the central relationship is established. At present, the main statistical finding does not appear sufficiently defensible to support the paper's overall conclusions.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study involves 114 pupils and their teachers, while teacher use of TPACK-aligned materials and pupil engagement are clearly measured from different respondents. Yet Table 3 reports a single correlation between teachers' utilization and students' engagement without explaining how teacher-level scores were matched with pupil-level scores, how many teachers were actually included, or how pupils nested under the same teacher were statistically handled. This is not a small reporting gap because it directly questions whether the reported relationship is statistically valid. If teacher scores were simply correlated with aggregated or repeated pupil scores, the independence assumption may be violated and the resulting coefficient can be seriously misleading.



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 manuscript presents a relevant analysis of TPACK aligned digital tools and pupil participation in Lutayan District II.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract: The abstract states a correlation coefficient of 0.96 but omits the precise p value.
Introduction: The text lacks robust synthesis of recent literature on technological pedagogical content knowledge.
Methodology: The authors must clarify instrument validation beyond a simple mean validity score.
Results: Table 1 duplicates Microsoft PowerPoint and Google Slides in the first and second rows.
Results: Table 2 contains a redundant Standard Deviation column.
Results: Table 3 improperly duplicates the Variable and Mean columns.
Discussion: The discussion states a Pearson correlation of 0.72, which contradicts the 0.96 abstract value.
Conclusion: The section makes broad claims about rural schools that extend beyond the specific gathered data.
Acknowledgment: This section inappropriately provides policy recommendations rather than actual gratitude to contributors.

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> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
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.			