



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Perceived Implementation of Reinforcement Strategies and Academic Performance of Intermediate Grade Pupils 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>
I see immense potential in your research. The work addresses an essential topic in education. To elevate the paper to a reputable standard, I offer several constructive comments. Please see the specific comments below.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title The title is clear, concise, and appropriately reflects the focus and scope of the study.
Abstract You omitted the exact sample size. State that the study involved 139 respondents. You state the correlation is 0.36. Mention the exact probability value too. Avoid redundant phrases. Make sentences direct.
Introduction The transition between paragraphs is adequate. You mention the MATATAG curriculum in the discussion, but you forgot to introduce it here. Add a brief explanation of this curriculum to



provide context. Clarify the specific local problem in Lutayan District II. State why this district requires this research.

Methodology

You wrote duplicate paragraphs. You repeat the sentence about the respondents twice. Please delete the duplicate. You mention the Slovin formula. State the exact final sample size calculated. You note the Cronbach alpha is 0.9022. This is excellent.

Results

Table 2 has a typographical error in the caption. It says 'implementation pupils' instead of 'intermediate pupils'. Please correct this. The table sequence is confused. The text states Table 3 shows teacher challenges, but the table for challenges is labeled Table 4. Fix the numerals. Do not repeat the exact numbers from the tables in your text. Summarize the main message instead. In the correlation table, you wrote 'Descision'. Correct the word to 'Decision'.

Discussion

The text repeats the results heavily. A proper discussion must interpret the results, not restate them. You introduce new concepts like B. F. Skinner theory here. Move theoretical frameworks to the Introduction. Ensure all authors cited here match the reference list.

Conclusion

The conclusion is overly long. Make it a single concise paragraph. Focus on the broader implications of the 0.36 correlation. Do not add recommendations here. Create a separate section for recommendations.

References

Format all entries consistently. Ensure every citation in the text appears in this list.

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 practical classroom issue and has potentially useful local value. However, I have serious concern with the central correlational analysis because the manuscript does not establish clearly what the actual unit of analysis was.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The correlation between reinforcement strategies and academic performance is presently difficult to accept as reported. The study identifies 139 respondents consisting of 92 pupils, 37 teachers, and 10 school heads, yet the academic-performance data are reported only for the 92 pupils. It is therefore unclear how the perception scores from three fundamentally different respondent groups were paired with pupil grades for the Pearson correlation. More concerning, the reported statistics themselves appear internally inconsistent: the manuscript gives $r = .36$



and $t = 4.22$, but these values do not correspond to either a sample of 92 pupils or the stated total of 139 respondents under the standard significance test for Pearson r . This raises a substantial question regarding what dataset and sample size were actually used in computing the correlation. Until the unit of analysis, pairing of observations, and basis of the reported test statistic are demonstrated clearly, the claim of a significant relationship, and consequently the interpretation that reinforcement accounts for 12.96% of academic performance, remains statistically uncertain.

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.			