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:	Revolutionizing Education: Boosting Student Motivation and Learning with Innovative and Inclusive Teaching Practices
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 researchers put significant effort into the study. I find that data must always match the narrative. The text has great potential but requires attention to detail.

Specific Comments and Recommendations
Title-The title is quite long. The authors should consider a concise version. A simpler title appears more professional.
Abstract-The abstract provides a clear summary. It states that the researchers evaluated 97 pupils. The abstract mentions a reliability coefficient of 0.892. The authors should add a brief sentence about the exact recommendations.
Introduction-The first section connects well with global educational priorities. The authors cite several recent studies appropriately. The authors should ensure that all cited works appear in the bibliography.
Methodology-The researchers selected a descriptive correlational research design. The text explains the five point scale clearly. The researchers explain the data collection steps well.

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

Results-The tables present the data clearly. Table 19, Table 20, and Table 21 show a correlation of 0.57 and a computed t value of 5.74. The tables show a decision to reject the null hypothesis. The authors should ensure consistent capitalization in table headers.
Discussion-The authors must fix a critical error here. The text states that there is no significant relationship between the variables. In the exact same sentence, the text states that the correlation coefficient is 0.57, which proves a positive influence. The authors cannot state that a relationship is absent while they simultaneously declare that a relationship exists. The authors must align the text with the tables.
Conclusion-The authors repeat the exact same contradiction in this section. The text claims three times that there is no significant relationship. The authors must rewrite these lines because the data show the opposite result.
References-The bibliography requires massive cleanup. The authors listed several sources multiple times. For example, the authors listed Darling Hammond four times. The authors listed Schunk four times. The authors listed Espada Chavarria twice. The authors must remove all duplicate entries.

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 addresses a relevant classroom concern, but in its present form, I am not yet convinced that the evidence is strong enough to support the claims being made. The main weakness is not simply in presentation but in the logic connecting the research design, measurement of the variables, statistical analysis, and the conclusions. Several statements go beyond what the study appears capable of demonstrating. This needs serious attention because it affects the scientific credibility of the entire paper, not only one section.
Specific Comments and Recommendations
The central analytical framework of the study is problematic. The authors explicitly used a descriptive-correlational design without manipulation, yet throughout the manuscript they repeatedly use causal language such as effects, influence, enhances, and positively influence. A correlation from a cross-sectional survey cannot establish that innovative or inclusive teaching practices caused better academic performance. More importantly, the manuscript does not adequately explain how academic performance was actually measured. The methodology states that the researcher-made questionnaire contained items on innovative teaching practices, inclusive teaching practices, student motivation, and academic performance, and the mean was used to determine the level of academic performance. This raises a fundamental question whether academic performance refers to actual school grades

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

or merely pupils' self-reported perception of their performance. These are not equivalent measures. If academic performance was measured through the same questionnaire completed by the same pupils who rated the teaching practices and motivation, the correlations may partly represent common-method measurement rather than a relationship with objectively demonstrated academic achievement. The concern becomes more serious because Tables 19, 20, and 21 report exactly the same correlation coefficient, r = 0.57, exactly the same computed t-value of 5.74, and exactly the same r^2 of 32% for three conceptually different relationships. Such exact replication across three separate variable pairs is unusual enough that the underlying computations and dataset require very careful verification. Until the operational definition of academic performance, its source of data, and the accuracy of these three independent correlation analyses are convincingly established, the manuscript's principal empirical claim remains uncertain.

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.			