International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Strengths and Struggles of Educators and Their Teaching Effectiveness as Perceived by Internal Stakeholders
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.
Authors and Affiliations- I noticed a major discrepancy. The main author list includes Jonathan P. Roque, Hanifa C. Kamid, and Sarah S Dimalen. Yet, the Author Contributions section lists Kamid, Dalmacio, and Roque. Sarah S Dimalen is absent from the contributions, and Ryan Dalmacio is absent from the main author list. You must fix this critical error. Also, please supply the absent correspondence email.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations
The manuscript presents a relevant topic. However, it requires thorough revision to reach publication quality.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title: The title is clear but lengthy. You could remove redundant words to make it more concise. A shorter version highlights the core variables better.
Abstract: The abstract contains a noticeable sentence fragment. Specifically, the sentence that begins with To assess the significant relationships stands alone without a main clause. You need to connect this to the previous sentence or rewrite it for clarity. Furthermore, the phrase

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

high struggles feels awkward. I suggest you choose a more academic descriptor like significant challenges.
Keywords: The keywords are appropriate. Ensure they match the exact terms you utilize most frequently within the text.
Introduction: Your introduction sets a good foundation but has citation format issues. You include first names for authors, such as James H. Stronge, 2020, and Linda Darling Hammond, 2021. Standard academic format requires only the last name of the author. Please revise all in text citations to follow standard style guidelines strictly.
Methodology: The methodology is generally sound, but you need to clarify the participant selection technique. You state that a selection method was utilized for the student respondents, but you fail to specify which exact technique was applied. Random, stratified, or convenience? You must explicitly state this detail so others can replicate your work.
Results: In Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3, you provide grand means, but you should also thoroughly explain the practical implications of the standard deviations. Additionally, in Table 2, you have inconsistent spaces with Grand Mean 3. 75. Please clean up all typographical errors within the tables. The statistical analysis in Table 4 and Table 5 is clear, but ensure all table formats meet the journal requirements.
Discussion: Your discussion accurately reflects the data but lacks a deeper theoretical connection. You introduce Social Cognitive Theory and Constructivist Theory in the introduction. However, you fail to integrate these theories back into your discussion section. A fifty year veteran in this field expects to see the results tied directly back to the theoretical framework to explain why these phenomena occur.
Conclusion: The conclusion is too repetitive. You start three consecutive sentences with the exact same word, Stakeholders. This stylistic choice reduces the academic impact of your final thoughts. Rewrite this section to provide a synthesized, powerful summary of your discoveries rather than a rigid list of facts.
Acknowledgment: You refer to Ma'am. Rhodina C. Castillo as his. Please correct this pronoun mismatch to maintain professionalism. Ensure all names and titles are accurate.
Conflict of Interest Statement: This section is standard and acceptable.
References: Your reference list needs rigorous edits. Some entries end with the publisher repeated twice, such as SAGE Publications. SAGE Publications and Routledge. Routledge. Clean up these duplications. Ensure every source cited in the text appears here and vice versa.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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.

International Journal of Transformative Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN Print: 3116-3009 | ISSN Online: 3116-3017
Driving Transformative Impact Across Disciplines

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations
The paper addresses a relevant issue on teacher strengths, struggles, and effectiveness, and the inclusion of different internal stakeholders gives the study potential value. However, I have a serious concern with the statistical logic of the study.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
The major problem is the unit of analysis and independence of observations in the correlation analysis. The study combines 4 principals, 14 teachers, and 151 pupils into an apparent total of 169 respondents, yet these respondents do not represent 169 independent observations of teachers; many pupils are necessarily evaluating teachers within the same classrooms and schools, while teachers appear to be evaluating themselves and principals are evaluating another level of the same teaching context. The Pearson correlations are nevertheless analyzed as though all responses belong to one homogeneous and independent sample, producing r = .59 for strengths and effectiveness and r = .09 for struggles and effectiveness. This creates a fundamental risk of pseudoreplication and distorted statistical significance, especially because the 151 pupil responses overwhelmingly determine the pooled results. More importantly, the paper later interprets these correlations as evidence that teacher strength plays a significant role in determining teacher effectiveness, which goes beyond what this data structure can reasonably establish.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

	Decision
	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

Decision	**Editor**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 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.			