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:	Innovative Instructional Strategies and the Writing Skills of Grade 4 Pupils in Lutayan District II Elementary Schools Under the MATATAG Curriculum
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
The paper addresses a relevant classroom concern under the MATATAG Curriculum, but I remain seriously concerned about whether the evidence presented actually measures what the study claims to measure. This issue affects the interpretation of the findings and, more importantly, the central contribution of the paper.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
The most fundamental concern is the operationalization of pupils' writing skills. The methodology states that a researcher-made questionnaire measured writing fluency, organization, vocabulary, creativity, grammar, and motivation, while the results subsequently classify pupils as proficient or advanced in these areas. This is difficult to defend because writing competence, particularly fluency, organization, vocabulary, creativity, and grammar, is normally demonstrated through actual written performance rather than respondents' perceptions of their own ability. The paper provides no writing task, scoring rubric, portfolio assessment, standardized writing measure, or independent evaluation of pupils' compositions.

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

Yet the manuscript repeatedly treats questionnaire scores as evidence of actual writing performance and even states that pupils possessed satisfactory writing abilities. This creates a serious construct-validity problem: the study may have measured perceived writing ability or attitudes toward writing, but it is presented throughout as an assessment of writing skills.
The manuscript explores an important educational topic. The effort to evaluate instructional methods alongside pupil proficiency shows promise. I appreciate the clear structure and the focus on the MATATAG curriculum.

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.

Reviewer 2

General Comments and Recommendations
The manuscript explores an important educational topic. The effort to evaluate instructional methods alongside pupil proficiency shows promise. I appreciate the clear structure and the focus on the MATATAG curriculum.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title The title is well-formulated and adequately conveys the central focus of the study.
Abstract The abstract summarizes the study well but reveals methodological confusion. The text claims to use a Two Way ANOVA to compare teacher and student perceptions. A t test is the correct statistical tool to compare two independent groups. The authors must correct this statistical mismatch. The abstract also mentions relationship assessments but reports ANOVA results instead of correlation results.
Introduction The introduction establishes relevant context by reference to Sustainable Development Goal 4. The authors present adequate background information on pupil difficulties. However, the literature review lacks a distinct research gap. The authors need to explicitly state what is unknown in current literature and how this study fills that exact void.
Methodology The method section describes a descriptive comparative design with 21 teachers and 199 pupils. The sample size determination uses Slovin formula. The authors should specify the exact margin of error used. Furthermore, the questionnaire validation process lacks detail. The authors must report the specific reliability coefficients like Cronbach alpha to prove instrument consistency.
Results

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

This section contains critical errors that invalidate the conclusions. Table 3 presents a Two Way ANOVA to compare two groups. As noted earlier, a simple comparison between teacher and student means requires a t test. Table 3 also contains a typographical error in the word Decision. Table 4 attempts to find a significant difference between instructional strategies and composition skills. These two variables exist on entirely different conceptual scales. The authors cannot compute a difference between a strategy frequency and a skill level. The authors must use Pearson correlation or multiple regression to test relationships between these variables.
Discussion The discussion adequately explains the frequent use of Collaborative methods and Project Based activities. The authors correctly identify that Journal activities occur less frequently. Because the statistical tests in the Results section are incorrect, the interpretations here are consequently flawed. Once the authors recalculate the data with correlation, they must completely rewrite this section to reflect the new statistical outputs.
Conclusion The conclusion repeats the specific results too closely. The authors state that instructional methods positively supported pupil skills. The reported non significant ANOVA results contradict this exact claim. A conclusion must align perfectly with the statistical evidence. The authors should revise this entire section after they correct the data analysis.
References The reference list includes recent and relevant literature. The format appears generally consistent. The authors should double check all digital object identifier links to ensure active connections.

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.			