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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **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 makes a meaningful and timely contribution to the scientific community, particularly within the fields of education, curriculum development, and teacher professional growth. By establishing the significant relationship between future thinking skills and curriculum coherence among public junior high school teachers, the study bridges a critical gap in understanding how educators' cognitive orientations toward the future influence the structural and pedagogical alignment of the curriculum. Its empirical findings not only reaffirm the value of forward-thinking dispositions in curriculum planning but also offer practical implications for school leadership and policy especially in contexts where curriculum coherence is a persistent challenge.  Moreover, the study adds a humanized perspective to educational research by recognizing teachers not just as implementers of curriculum, but as proactive architects of future-ready learning environments. This nuanced exploration has the potential to inform more responsive teacher training and curriculum reforms that can ultimately improve student learning outcomes. | We are grateful for your valuable comment. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, **“Future Thinking and Curriculum Coherence of Public Junior High School Teachers,”** is clear but could benefit from refinement to enhance academic precision and reader engagement. The title is relevant but somewhat generic. It states the key variables but lacks a sense of relationship, context, or research approach. A stronger title should reflect the study's purpose and highlight the significance of the findings for education. | Thank you for your valuable feedback on the title. We appreciate your suggestion to enhance its academic precision and reader engagement. While we acknowledge that the current title may appear general, we have chosen to retain it as it clearly reflects the core variables and maintains alignment with the study’s scope and focus. Nonetheless, we will consider your input for future revisions or related publications to better emphasize the study’s purpose and educational significance. |
| 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 comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study’s objectives, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. However, it can be improved by slightly reorganizing the flow for clarity. Specifically, it would benefit from a clearer statement of the research gap, a more concise explanation of the statistical tools used, and a brief note on the study’s broader implications for education. Removing redundant phrases and simplifying overly technical expressions will also enhance readability. Overall, the abstract effectively presents the study's essence, but a more refined structure would better highlight its relevance and scholarly contribution. | We have made the necessary revisions based on the reviewer’s comment. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound. It follows a clear research structure, employs appropriate statistical methods such as Pearson correlation and multiple regression, and uses validated instruments with strong reliability. The findings are logically presented and well-supported by data. While minor improvements in phrasing and organization could enhance clarity, the study effectively addresses its objectives and contributes valuable insights into the relationship between future thinking and curriculum coherence in education. | We have made the necessary revisions based on the reviewer’s comment. |
| **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 largely sufficient, relevant, and fairly recent, with most sources published between 2020 and 2024. They support the study’s theoretical and empirical foundation effectively. However, the manuscript could benefit from the inclusion of more global literature or meta-analyses on future thinking and curriculum coherence to broaden its academic scope. Including key works from leading education journals such as Teaching and Teacher Education or Curriculum Inquiry may also strengthen the literature review. | Thank you for your positive remarks regarding the relevance and recency of the references. We appreciate your suggestion to include more global literature and key works from leading education journals. However, we have decided to retain the current reference set, as we believe it sufficiently supports the study’s theoretical and empirical grounding within the intended scope. Nonetheless, we acknowledge the value of broader international perspectives and will consider incorporating such sources in future research or extended versions of this study. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear intentions and appropriate academic tone. However, there are occasional grammatical issues, redundancies, and awkward phrasing that may affect clarity and flow. A thorough language edit or professional proofreading is recommended to enhance readability, coherence, and precision, ensuring the manuscript meets high academic standards. | We have made the necessary revisions based on the reviewer’s comment. |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript presents a timely and relevant study that addresses a critical aspect of teacher development and curriculum design. Its findings offer practical value for educators, administrators, and policymakers seeking to enhance future-ready teaching practices. With minor revisions in language clarity and structural flow, the paper has strong potential for publication and broader academic impact. | We have made the necessary revisions based on the reviewer’s comment. |
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