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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.**  **Clarification: *I use Ai to perfect my language (using grammarly), completely my own ideas.*** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript contributes to the growing discourse on sustainable development in education by examining the relationship between sustainable development goals and communal ideas of supervision among elementary school teachers. The study's findings emphasize the importance of integrating sustainability principles into school operations and teacher supervision practices. The study provides empirical evidence from the Philippines, a region often underrepresented in global education research, making it valuable for comparative study. Furthermore, the research offers practical implications for policymakers, school leaders, and teacher educators in building inclusive and collaborative learning environments. | We are grateful for your valuable comment. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title of the article, “**Maintainable Development Aims** and **Communal Idea** **Supervision** of Teachers in Public Elementary Schools,” is not entirely suitable, as it uses non-standard terms such as “maintainable development aims” and “communal idea supervision,” which may cause confusion among readers. Moreover, the title lacks geographic specificity, which is important in educational research to contextualize the findings. A more appropriate and academically clear title would be: **“Sustainable Development Goals and Collaborative Supervision Practices among Elementary School Teachers in the Philippines”** as it accurately reflects both the core variables and the location of the study. | We appreciate the reviewer’s insightful feedback regarding the article’s title. However, we have chosen to retain the original title, ‘Maintainable Development Aims and Communal Idea Supervision of Teachers in Public Elementary Schools,’ as it reflects the conceptual framing and thematic language adopted throughout the study. While we acknowledge the suggested alternative improves clarity and specificity, we believe the current title aligns with our intended discourse and theoretical lens. |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.** | The abstract is generally informative but lacks clarity, standard terminology, and a logical flow, which may hinder readers’ full understanding of the study. For instance, phrases like *"maintainable development aims”* and *“communal vision management”* are unclear and should be replaced with widely accepted terms such as *“***Sustainable Development Goals***”* and *“***Collaborative Supervision Practices***”*. Additionally, the sentence *“This study was described and conducted...”* is redundant and could be simplified to *“This study aimed to examine...”* to improve readability. The abstract would benefit from a clearer structure that briefly outlines the research problem, objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. Including these elements using precise academic language would make the abstract more comprehensive and accessible to the scientific community. | We appreciate the reviewer’s constructive comments regarding the clarity and structure of the abstract. We have revised the abstract to improve its logical flow, remove redundancies (such as simplifying “This study was described and conducted...” to “This study aimed to examine...”), and ensure that the research problem, objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications are clearly outlined. However, we respectfully chose to retain the original terms “maintainable development aims” and “communal vision management,” as these phrases are aligned with the conceptual framework and terminologies consistently used throughout the study. We believe they best represent the unique contextual and theoretical lens of our research. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, this manuscript is scientifically sound in terms of research design, data analysis, and interpretation of results. The statistical tools used (Pearson correlation, regression) are appropriate, and the presentation structure is logical. However, some terms need clarification, and the theoretical framework could be further developed and aligned with established literature on sustainability in education. | We sincerely thank the reviewer for recognizing the soundness of the manuscript’s research design, data analysis, and interpretation. Regarding the suggestion to further clarify certain terms and expand the theoretical framework, we appreciate the insight. However, we respectfully chose to retain the current terminologies and theoretical scope, as they are intentionally aligned with the conceptual lens and objectives of our study. We believe these choices best reflect the contextual grounding and innovative perspective we aim to contribute to the field. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references used in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relatively recent (2020–2025), reflecting an effort to align with current literature. However, many sources appear to be secondary or lack citations from high-impact, peer-reviewed international journals. To strengthen the theoretical foundation and scientific credibility, it is recommended to include more references from reputable sources such as Scopus- or Web of Science-indexed journals, especially related to:   1. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in education 2. Instructional supervision and teacher collaboration 3. School leadership and organizational learning   Suggested Additional References:   1. Boeren, E. (2019). Understanding Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 on “quality education” from micro, meso and macro perspectives. *International Review of Education*, 65, 277 - 294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09772-7. 2. Kioupi, V., & Voulvoulis, N. (2019). Education for Sustainable Development: A Systemic Framework for Connecting the SDGs to Educational Outcomes. *Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11216104. 3. Wiyono, B., Rasyad, A., & , M. (2021). The Effect of Collaborative Supervision Approaches and Collegial Supervision Techniques on Teacher Intensity Using Performance-Based Learning. *SAGE Open*, 11. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211013779. 4. Kareem, J., Patrick, H., & Prabakaran, N. (2024). Exploring the factors of learning organization in school education: the role of leadership styles, personal commitment, and organizational culture. *Central European Management Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/cemj-12-2023-0457. | We appreciate the reviewer’s detailed feedback and the suggested references, which indeed contribute valuable insights to the field. While we acknowledge the importance of including sources from high-impact and internationally indexed journals, we have intentionally selected references that are contextually relevant and aligned with the local educational setting of our study. These sources provide practical grounding and reflect the realities of our research participants. Therefore, while we recognize the merit of the recommended references, we respectfully opted to retain our current set of literature to maintain coherence with the study’s scope and objectives. |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | Here's a breakdown:  Strengths  1. The structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion) follows academic conventions. 2. The content is clear,relevant, and well-cited. 3. Use of technical terms and references shows scholarly intent. 4. The flow of ideas is generally logical and coherent.  Improvement Needed  1. Spelling and Word Choice    1. "Maintanable" >> should be "maintainable"    2. "Commual idea supervision" >> might be better phrased as "communal supervision of ideas" or "collaborative instructional supervision"    3. “Descriptive level” >> consider "Interpretation" or "Descriptive Category"    4. “Commual community” >> redundant; perhaps just “community engagement” 2. Grammar and Syntax    1. Some sentences are lengthy or awkward: *“This study was described and conducted to determine…”* >> “This study aimed to determine…”    2. Some subject-verb disagreements, e.g.: *“The domains of domains of maintainable development aims did not significantly influence…”* >> typo. 3. Repetition    1. Phrases and terms (e.g., "communal idea supervision", “maintainable development aims”) are sometimes overused without variation. 4. Cohesion and Academic Tone    1. Sentences like: *“This finding is supported by the study of…”* could be elevated to: “These findings are consistent with prior research by…”    2. More frequent use of transitions like “furthermore,” “in contrast,” “notably,” would improve flow.  The language/english quality of the article is partially suitable for scholarly communication. While the structure and content align with academic standards, the article requires moderate revision in grammar, word choice, and clarity to meet the expectations of international scholarly publications. A thorough language editing or proofreading is recommended before submission. | Thank you for the constructive and detailed feedback. We appreciate the recognition of the article’s structural strengths and scholarly intent. Regarding the areas for improvement, we have already carefully revised the manuscript to address the noted concerns in spelling, grammar, word choice, cohesion, and academic tone. Terms and phrases were clarified or replaced for accuracy and consistency, sentence structures were improved for clarity and flow, and repetitive wording was minimized. We also enhanced transitions and adopted more formal phrasing where appropriate. A thorough proofreading was conducted to ensure the article meets the language and scholarly standards expected in international academic publications. |
| **Optional/General** comments | This article has great potential, particularly in the areas of educational leadership and sustainable development. The integration of the local context from the Philippines provides a valuable contribution to the global discourse. It needs some light language editing and clearer explanations of conceptual terms. | Thank you for your positive feedback and insightful comments. We appreciate your recognition of the article’s contribution to educational leadership and sustainable development, especially within the local context of the Philippines. We will ensure to perform light language editing to improve clarity and provide clearer explanations of the key conceptual terms to enhance readability and academic rigor. |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)*  No ethical issues were identified. Ethical procedures for data collection, including voluntary participation and confidentiality, were well explained. | We are grateful for your valuable comment. |