

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55295

Title: Enhancing Licensure Examination Readiness in General and Professional Education: Evidence from a Pretest–Posttest Study of Structured Review Lectures

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....YES.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Mr. Javaid Ahmad Khan

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This paper deeply examined the effectiveness of structured Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) review lectures in improving pre-service teachers' readiness in General Education and Professional Education. But first of all, the title is too general. Title of any research article should be specific and clear but here in this case it is not specific and not clear for which area this research belongs to? what will be the subjects of research? etc. After this, researcher has used short forms or abbreviations like BEED, BSED without their full form in the abstract that is also not acceptable in research. Also there is no mention of limitations and implications of this paper. However, the researcher has mentioned sample size and methodology very well. Results are also discussed deeply and all the findings are associated with statistical data properly. So after making these minor changes, this paper can be accepted.

Reason for Minor Changes

First of all, the title of this research article is too general. Best research article is that which is as specific as possible. Title should be specific on the bases of area, subject, field, population etc. In addition to this, the researcher has used some short forms like BEED, BSED without their full form in the abstract, that must be avoided. Not all are aware about these terms. The researcher has also skipped the limitations section, educational implications and further suggestion section, all these section are very important for research paper. So by making all the changes this paper can be accepted.

Abstract

In this paper the abstract summarizes paper's purpose, methods, results, and conclusions comprehensively, using clear, active voice, avoiding citations, and also included keywords. Sample size and tools used for data analyzing all these things are given. But some short forms or abbreviations like BEED and BSED has been used by the researcher without mentioning their full form by which it

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

becomes difficult for many readers to understand abstract properly. So this should be avoided. Also there is no mention of research area or respondents on which the study is based. In abstract it should be clearly mentioned to which place this study belongs, who may be the respondents? etc.

Introduction

The introduction part in this paper is effectively making linkage to the topic. Introduction part should grab attention, provide background context to orient the reader, and should contain the outline or roadmap of the paper's structure, here all of these things are present. Also the research gap has clearly found out by researcher.

Methodology

Researcher has thoroughly mentioned the methods and tools for conducting this study and analyzing data. a quasi-experimental pretest–posttest design with repeated measures was employed in the present study. The intervention consisted of structured LET review lectures, guided drills, and mock examinations, implemented uniformly across all participants following a standardized instructional plan. The participants consisted of 78 LET takers from the Department of Teacher Education at the City College of Calamba, comprising 42 Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) graduates, 18 Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English, 14 BSSED–Mathematics, and 4 BSSED–Science graduates.

Results

The result section is given in detail in this manuscript. Main findings such as Performance in Professional Education (67.79%) was higher than in General Education (60.12%), indicating stronger initial pedagogical competence than content knowledge. Across programs, BSSED-Science students showed the highest baseline proficiency (68.59%), while BEED (63.66%), BSSED-English (62.64%), and BSSED-Mathematics (60.93%) scored lower, reflecting differences in curriculum exposure and program focus. The paired-sample t-test (Table 5) comparing pretest and posttest scores in General Education showed no significant improvement ($t(74) = -0.738$, $p = 0.463$). The minimal gain (65.54% → 66.61%) suggests that the current review lectures were insufficient to substantially improve content knowledge, all these findings are given in detail with statistical figures.

Discussion

The discussion section has been discussed very good and all the results were compared with the previous studies and findings, However, the researcher has not provided the limitations of this research and further suggestions by which the validity of research papers decreases and becomes less effective.

Conclusion

Over all the research paper is good, after making the changes which has been mentioned in this report, this article can be accepted.