



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Teacher Positive Well-Being Across Mathematics Teaching Assignment in the Philippine SEA-PLM 2024 Teacher Dataset: An ANCOVA Controlling for Teaching Experience and Classroom Problems
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

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

General Comments and Recommendations

You present a relevant exploration of educator wellness within the context of Southeast Asian education. I appreciate your attempt to evaluate pedagogical contexts. The study possesses a clear conceptual basis grounded in the JD R model.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Title

The current title reveals the specific statistical test utilized. You state that the study is an analysis of covariance with controls for experience and class difficulties. To include the exact statistical method in the title reads like a student thesis rather than a mature scholarly article. I advise you to shorten the title to capture the main variables without explicit methodological declarations. A concise title captures reader attention more effectively.

Abstract

Your abstract provides a decent summary of the parameters of the study. You report the exact statistical outputs, such as p equals .508 and omega squared equals .000. While precise, such



granular statistical details often clutter an abstract. You should focus on the broader implications of the results. Furthermore, you conclude that the results underscore the potential importance of class conditions. You must provide a more explicit practical implication here rather than a vague call for future research.

Introduction

The transition from the broad context of post pandemic recovery to the specific JD R framework appears abrupt. You cite the JD R model by Bakker and Demerouti to explain the balance between work demands and available resources. However, you fail to build a strong theoretical bridge that explains why you selected class difficulties and years of professional work as the specific covariates. You cite previous literature to state that STEM instruction creates stress. You must expand on why the Philippine context might uniquely alter these established dynamics.

Methodology

You rely on listwise deletion to handle absent data, which results in a final sample of 477 educators. Listwise deletion often introduces bias and reduces statistical power. You should employ modern data imputation techniques. Additionally, you describe the design as a nonexperimental secondary data analysis design. This phrase is unnecessarily wordy. You can simply state that you conducted a retrospective observational study. Furthermore, you measure class difficulties through variables like student hunger and lack of sleep. You must elaborate on the validity of these specific indicators.

Results

You report that the Shapiro Wilk test indicates deviations from perfect normality for the residuals. You dismiss this deviation through reliance on the sample size and a visual check. As a rigorous researcher, you should test robust data transformations before you accept the deviation. The mean score for those who instruct the subject is 52.93, compared to 52.42 for the others. You correctly identify this difference as minimal. However, you need to present the assumption checks with more visual data in the main text rather than solely in the appendices.

Discussion

You observe that the results contradict expectations about the distinct disadvantage of the subject assignment. You attribute this to broad occupational pressures shared across all subjects. This insight is valuable, but you need to connect it back to the JD R model more robustly. Do class difficulties act as a universal demand that suppresses subject specific nuances? You suggest that the immediate realities of class life shape educator wellness more than subject assignment. You should integrate more localized literature to support this bold claim.

Conclusion

Your conclusion recommends that schools focus on class conditions to support educator wellness. This recommendation remains too generic. You highlight that issues like student absenteeism and disruptive behavior matter most. Therefore, you must propose concrete administrative interventions. What specific policies should school leaders implement based on your evidence? A strong paper ends with actionable directives.

Acknowledgment

You made a critical error in this section. The text currently reads like a set of instructions for authors, such as the statement that authors must distinguish between substantial intellectual contribution and general support. You also left the directive that the declaration of financial support is a mandatory component. You must delete this boilerplate template text entirely and replace it with your actual expressions of gratitude. Such oversights severely damage the professional credibility of the submission.

Conflict of Interest



You declare no relevant financial or non financial interests. This statement appears standard and correct. I have no further criticisms for this specific section.

References

Your reference list contains a significant error. The citation for the article published in Behavioral Sciences is absent the name of the first author. It starts abruptly with an initial, L., Rao, Z.. You must correct this format mistake. Careful attention to citation formats is non negotiable for academic publication.

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 study addresses a relevant question using an important large-scale dataset, but I am not yet convinced that the main inferential findings can be considered reliable. My main concern is not with presentation or interpretation, but with the statistical framework used for the SEA-PLM data.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The analysis appears to treat the 477 teachers as if they came from an ordinary independent sample and then applies a conventional ANCOVA. This is a serious concern because SEA-PLM is a complex, multistage large-scale assessment, not a simple random survey. The manuscript gives no indication that teacher sampling weights, replicate weights, clustering within sampled schools or classes, or design-based variance estimation were incorporated. If these design features were ignored, the reported standard errors, confidence intervals, F statistics, and p values cannot automatically be assumed valid. More importantly, the entire substantive conclusion rests on these tests: mathematics teaching assignment is declared nonsignificant, while classroom problems are declared significant at $p = .023$. With an effect already this small, a different design-based standard error could materially affect that inference. This is therefore not merely a technical reporting omission. It raises a fundamental question about whether the statistical model corresponds to the structure of the dataset at all.



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