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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **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 addresses an understudied area in educational leadership by exploring the correlation between school heads’ structural cultural viewpoints and teachers’ directional practices within a rural Philippine context. The topic is timely and relevant, especially given the global emphasis on leadership-driven school improvement. While the study’s geographic scope is localized, the implications extend to broader discussions on the role of leadership culture in instructional effectiveness. However, the manuscript could benefit from a stronger theoretical grounding to establish its contribution more explicitly within the existing body of international  literature. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title reflects the core constructs but contains minor grammatical inconsistencies. It is unclear and slightly awkward in phrasing. A more academically refined title could be: *“Structural Cultural Perspectives of School Leaders and Their Influence on Teachers’ Directional Practices in Philippine Public Elementary Schools.”* This revision improves clarity and situates the study within its national context. |  |
| **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 adequately outlines the study's purpose, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. However, it lacks a compelling rationale for the research and does not contextualize the significance of the topic early on. Phrases like “oftentimes manifested” are unclear and not academically precise. Replacing them with clearly defined levels or statistical results would enhance the abstract’s rigor and communicative value.  Additionally, the final sentence is overly broad and reads more like a policy statement than a conclusion rooted in empirical findings. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Introduction: The introduction is rich in comparative international perspectives and appropriately situates the problem within both global and local contexts. Nevertheless, it suffers from some redundancy and lacks a clear articulation of a conceptual or theoretical framework that guides the study. Citations are relevant but under- theorized; the manuscript would benefit from embedding the variables within a more established leadership or organizational culture model (e.g., Schein, Hofstede, or Hallinger frameworks).  Methods: The research design is generally appropriate, employing a non-experimental correlational approach. However, the use of universal sampling, though practical, raises questions about generalizability and potential respondent bias. There is minimal discussion of how confounding variables were controlled, and while validity and reliability are addressed, no psychometric properties (e.g., factor loadings) of the instruments are presented. Ethical procedures are well described, which strengthens the study’s credibility.  Results: The results are clearly organized and systematically presented. However, the interpretation is largely descriptive and does not delve deeply into the implications of the effect sizes or the predictive strength of each domain. The reporting could benefit from a clearer statistical narrative that discusses practical significance, not just statistical significance. Including graphical representations would enhance readability and interpretation.  Discussion: The discussion section successfully links findings to existing literature, but the analysis remains surface-level. There is little critical engagement with contradictory findings or limitations of the methodology. The discussion leans heavily on affirming existing assumptions rather than challenging or expanding them.  Greater integration of theory would provide a more nuanced interpretation of why certain structural domains influence directional practices more strongly.  Conclusion: The conclusions are valid and align with the findings but tend to restate results rather than synthesize them into broader educational or leadership implications. A more critical reflection on limitations—such as the lack of longitudinal data or contextual variability among schools—would add scholarly maturity. Directions for  future research are helpful but could be more specific in outlining alternative methodologies or comparative contexts. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references cited in the manuscript are generally relevant and provide a good foundation for the study. However, many of the sources appear to be older than 5 years, especially in the core areas of leadership and organizational culture. Given the rapidly evolving nature of educational research, it is critical to ensure that at least a majority of the references are from the past five years to reflect the latest findings and theoretical  developments in the field. |  |
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|  | Currently, the manuscript references a number of older works (e.g., 2020, 2021), but a substantial portion of the literature falls outside of this recent window. To enhance the manuscript’s timeliness and relevance, I recommend increasing the number of recent studies from the past five years, particularly those addressing contemporary educational leadership, school culture, and teacher practices. Additionally, the author could explore recent works on educational reforms in Southeast Asia, as well as publications that address organizational culture in the context of educational settings post-pandemic. |  |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally clear and understandable, but there are areas where improvement is necessary for scholarly communication. While the overall structure of the sentences is functional, the manuscript would benefit from more formal academic language, precise phrasing, and a reduction in redundancy.  Several sections exhibit issues related to clarity, especially in terms of unclear expressions like “oftentimes demonstrated” or “oftentimes manifested,” which are imprecise for academic writing. The use of passive voice is prevalent throughout, which could be revised to a more active voice for greater clarity and readability.  Additionally, certain phrases are somewhat colloquial and can be reworded for more formal scholarly communication. For example, "data were collected" could be rephrased as "data collection was carried out," which would sound more professional.  In some areas, punctuation could also be adjusted for better flow, particularly in longer sentences that could be broken into shorter, more digestible parts. The manuscript would also benefit from consistency in verb tense usage and avoiding abrupt shifts between present and past tense.  Additionally, while the manuscript includes helpful technical terms from the field of educational leadership and organizational culture, there is occasional overuse of overly broad terms like “improvement” and “growth.” Using more specific terminology could make the manuscript’s arguments sharper and more focused. |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | 1. The manuscript addresses an important area in educational leadership with potential to provide valuable insights for rural Philippine contexts but needs a stronger theoretical framework to better position the study within existing literature. 2. The title is relevant but should be revised for clarity. Suggested revision: “Structural Cultural Perspectives of School Leaders and Their Influence on Teachers’ Directional Practices in Philippine Public Elementary Schools.” 3. The abstract is comprehensive but lacks a compelling rationale. Terms like “oftentimes demonstrated” and “oftentimes manifested” should be replaced with more precise language, and the final sentence should focus on specific findings rather than being too broad. 4. The introduction provides a solid background but needs a clearer conceptual framework and stronger theoretical integration (e.g., Schein, Hofstede). The methods are appropriate, but more details on confounding variables and sampling limitations are needed. The results are well-presented but could benefit from more statistical interpretation and visual aids. The discussion should engage more critically with contradictory findings and limitations, and the conclusion could reflect more on limitations and future research directions. 5. Some references are outdated. Including more recent studies (within the last 5 years) would enhance the   manuscript’s timeliness. Additional recent references should be included.   1. The language is generally clear but requires refinement to meet scholarly standards. There are issues with unclear expressions, passive voice, and informal phrasing. Sentence structure, clarity, and consistency in verb   tense need to be improved. |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |
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