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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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 holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the critical issue of teachers’ stages of concern regarding curriculum evaluation and innovation in primary schools. Additionally, the findings contribute to the broader discourse on educational innovation, offering a framework for understanding and addressing resistance to change within teaching communities. This research is essential for advancing effective curriculum reforms and enhancing educational quality in diverse and dynamic learning environments. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is clear and descriptive. |  |
| 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. | It provides a clear overview of the study, including its purpose, methodology, findings, and key factors affecting teachers’ concerns regarding curriculum innovation evaluation. However, it could benefit from some refinements for improved clarity. Here are my suggestions:  1) Add contextual background: Briefly explain the significance of curriculum evaluation and why understanding teachers’ concerns is vital.  2) Remove redundancy: Some detailed statistical results, such as percentile scores, can be omitted from the abstract and reserved for the main text. Instead, focus on summarizing trends or major conclusions. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | It appears to be scientifically correct in its methodology, data collection, and analysis. However, certain aspects could be improved to ensure rigor, clarity, and alignment with scientific standards. Here are my suggestions:  1) Sampling justification: The sample size (50 teachers) is relatively small compared to the population (500 teachers). While random sampling is used, the representativeness of the sample should be justified.  - Suggestion: Include a discussion of potential limitations due to sample size and sampling method.  2) Clarity of terminology: Some terms (e.g., “stage of concern,” “curriculum innovation”) are used without sufficient initial explanation.  - Suggestion: Define these terms explicitly in the introduction.  3) Statistical rigor: The study relies on descriptive statistics, which is appropriate for categorization. However, additional inferential statistical analysis could validate whether the findings are statistically significant and generalizable.  - Suggestion: Use statistical tests to assess differences across stages or factors. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references are moderately sufficient but could benefit from the inclusion of more recent and diverse studies.  Suggestions for Improvement:  1) Include more recent literature:  Darling-Hammond, L. et al. (2017). “Empowered Educators: How High-Performing Systems Shape Teaching Quality Around the World.” Jossey-Bass  2) Research on teacher professional development:  Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional Development and Teacher Change. Teachers and Teaching, 8(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512  3) Modern Applications of CBAM:  Anderson, S. E. (2018). “CBAM: A model for evaluating change in educational innovation.” |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language of the manuscript is generally understandable but falls short of the polished standard expected for scholarly communication. Certain areas require improvements in grammar, clarity, and academic tone to enhance readability and professionalism. Below is an assessment with suggestions for improvement:  1) Grammar and syntax:  - Issues such as subject-verb agreement, sentence fragments, and improper use of articles are present.  Example: “Teachers’ stage of concern to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation was low.”  Suggested revision: “Teachers’ stages of concern regarding the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were found to be low.”  2) Clarity and conciseness:  - Some sentences are overly long and could be simplified for better understanding.  Example: “Data related to factors affecting teachers’ stage of concern to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were collected in the form of forum discussion and study of related literature.”  Suggested revision: “Data on factors influencing teachers’ concerns about primary school curriculum evaluation were collected through forum discussions and literature reviews.”  3) Academic tone:  - Certain phrases lack the formal tone required for scholarly work.  Example: “It was caused by the lack of understanding of primary school teachers...’  Suggested revision: “This was attributed to primary school teachers’ limited understanding...”  4) Improved vocabulary:  - Replace informal words with more scholarly alternatives.  Example 1: Replace “teachers’ lack of concern” with “teachers’ limited engagement or awareness.”  Example 2: Original: “The findings of this study were 10 % in a stage of awareness, 14 % in the stage of information...  Revised: “This study found that 10% of teachers were at the awareness stage, 14% at the information stage...”  Example 3: Original: “The curriculum is continually changing.”  Revised: “The curriculum undergoes frequent revisions, contributing to challenges in its implementation.” |  |
| Optional/General comments | Suggestions for improvement:  Proofreading: Have the manuscript professionally proofread to address grammatical errors and ensure a polished tone. |  |
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