

## Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: S.P.E.A.K. (Speech Performance, Engagement, Articulation, and Knowledge): An Intervention to Enhance Oral Communication Skills among Senior High School Students

Version: 1

### Comments:

A timely and practically useful participatory action study. The S.P.E.A.K. program is clearly described and the student narratives are compelling. The manuscript is largely well-structured and readable. Before publication (or for a stronger final-proof version) I suggest clarifications in methods (action-research cycles/fidelity), transparency about analytic procedures and saturation, and a short reflection on researcher role and potential social desirability bias when the researcher also facilitated the program.

### Major

1. The paper identifies the design as Participatory Action Research and describes implementation over the 2024–2025 year, but it is unclear whether multiple PAR cycles (plan–act–observe–reflect) occurred, and how fidelity to the S.P.E.A.K. protocol was monitored. Please add a concise paragraph clarifying (a) the number/timing of action cycles, (b) any session plan or fidelity checklist used, and (c) whether sessions were delivered exactly as designed or adapted during implementation.
2. The qualitative findings are rich, but readers may wonder whether there is any objective or instructor-rated evidence of improvement (rubric scores, teacher observations, pre-post speaking rubric, participation logs). If no quantitative measures were collected, state this explicitly and briefly explain why (PAR focus on experiential change). If some teacher rubrics or observation notes exist, consider adding a short supplementary table or sentence summarizing these indicators.
3. The Methods state purposive selection of 10 students (6 FGD, 4 IDI). Please (a) report whether any students declined or withdrew, (b) provide brief participant descriptors (gender, age range, strand/section) in a small table or paragraph, and (c) explain how saturation was judged (for example: “no new codes emerged after interview 8 as shown in analytic memos”).
4. The manuscript reports “thematic analysis.” Add a short worked example (one raw quote → code → category → theme) or describe the coding process step-by-step (first-cycle open coding, codebook development, cross-checks). State whether software was used or if coding was manual, and whether there was any inter-coder check or peer debriefing.
5. The researcher facilitated the S.P.E.A.K. activities and conducted interviews. Add a short reflexivity statement acknowledging this dual role and steps taken to reduce bias (e.g., using an independent co-moderator for some FGDs, keeping analytic memos, member checking).
6. The manuscript notes ethical clearance and assent for those under 18; to strengthen transparency add the approving body’s name and date/approval number if available (or state that an approval number is not assigned).

### Minor

1. Consider a one-line participant flow (n invited → n participated → n in FGD/IDI).
2. Table 1 is helpful, consider adding a short sample session timetable (one-week or sample lesson) as an appendix or brief in-text example.
3. Tidy minor typographic inconsistencies (e.g., hyphenation of “self-efficacy” vs “self efficacy”).
4. The abstract could explicitly state n = 10 and the academic year (2024–2025) in one place.

Overall recommendation: Minor revisions. Manuscript is publishable; suggested clarifications will strengthen methodological transparency and utility for practitioners.

## Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: S.P.E.A.K. (Speech Performance, Engagement, Articulation, and Knowledge): An Intervention to Enhance Oral Communication Skills among Senior High School Students

Version: 1

### Comments:

An engaging applied study with clear practical implications for oral communication pedagogy. The themes are well captured and the Discussion links theory to practice. I recommend modest changes: deepen the practical implementation guidance and tighten discussion of limitations/transferability (culture, sample size, possible Hawthorne effect).

### Major

1. The paper recommends mentorship, extended practice, and individualized feedback. Please convert these into short actionable items (for example: “Implement 30–45 minute weekly S.P.E.A.K. sessions for one semester; integrate monthly 1:1 feedback sessions; use a 5-item teacher rubric to monitor progress”). Concrete examples increase uptake by teachers/schools.
2. Acknowledge potential Hawthorne or social desirability effects due to the researcher facilitating the intervention and also collecting data. If any mitigation (e.g., anonymity in transcripts, member checking outside class time) was used, state it.
3. Given the Philippine context and student comments emphasizing peer support and belonging, add a short reflection on cultural factors (collectivism, classroom norms) that may have amplified collaborative benefits and how that might affect transfer to different settings.
4. Results show uneven emphasis across components (students noted articulation got less attention). Suggest adding one or two concrete edits to the intervention description (Table 1) showing how time could be redistributed, e.g., “Week 6–7: Audio-assisted articulation practice (3 sessions) + individual coaching.”

### Minor

1. A short concluding paragraph with a one-paragraph practitioner “how-to” would be valuable.
2. Check the reference formatting for a few entries (consistent retrieval/DOI formatting).

Overall recommendation: Minor revisions.

## Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: S.P.E.A.K. (Speech Performance, Engagement, Articulation, and Knowledge): An Intervention to Enhance Oral Communication Skills among Senior High School Students

Version: 2

### Comments:

Revisions are substantially complied. The paper is now recommended for publication.

## Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: S.P.E.A.K. (Speech Performance, Engagement, Articulation, and Knowledge): An Intervention to Enhance Oral Communication Skills among Senior High School Students

Version: 2

### Comments:

Revisions are substantially complied. The paper is now recommended for publication.