



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	The Role of Journalistic Ethics in Information Consumption: A Phenomenological Study Among Senior High School Student Journalists in the Age of Fake News
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

I find your study on student journalists and information consumption to be highly relevant, though it requires greater theoretical and methodological precision before publication. Please revise your paper to explicitly anchor your analysis in the Elements of Journalism framework specifically referencing the discipline of verification and loyalty to citizens while also stating the exact participant count of two student reporters and the Davao City location. Furthermore, your methodology must be expanded to specify the use of asynchronous online interviews and thematic analysis, while clearly highlighting findings related to fact-checking and source comparison. Please ensure all these targeted enhancements are thoroughly addressed, as your revised manuscript will be evaluated directly by the managing editor rather than returning to the initial peer reviewers.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Your abstract currently lacks a direct reference to the specific theoretical lens that guides your analysis. Please explicitly mention the Elements of Journalism framework, specifically highlighting the principles of obligation to truth, loyalty to citizens, and the discipline of verification. In the methodology section, you must clearly specify the exact format used for data collection. State explicitly that you utilized asynchronous online interviews to gather responses from the student journalists. Furthermore, clarify the exact location of your research to contextualize the findings for the readers. Make sure to specify that the participants were drawn from a school publication in Davao City. Incorporating these precise details will thoroughly fortify your research design.

General Comments and Recommendations

This qualitative study provides a timely examination of how student journalists navigate the complexities of information consumption in the digital age. The methodological approach is appropriate for the research aims, but the manuscript requires a more explicit statement of your specific theoretical framework in the abstract to ground the study. Enhancing the transparency of your participant selection criteria will also significantly elevate the academic rigor of your methodology. Implementing these small adjustments will solidify your core arguments.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The abstract currently lacks the exact participant count. You must write that two qualified student reporters joined the research. The method section also needs a clear name for the analysis type. Tell the audience that you utilized thematic analysis to examine the responses. Finally, list the exact ethical judgments in the text. Add fact checks and source comparison to the results paragraph. The readers will appreciate these specific facts.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
I read the article about student reporters and fake news. The topic is very relevant for schools today. The text needs some exact details to become perfect. I propose a few edits below to help the audience.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			