



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Fostering Religiosity among Senior High School Students in Catholic School through FAITH (Faithfulness, Adherence, Involvement, Trust, and Holiness)
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

<u>Comments and Recommendations</u>
I find your study on spiritual development highly informative, though it requires greater demographic and evaluative precision before publication. Please revise your abstract to explicitly state that the research involved ten Grade 11 students in Davao City and clearly delineate both the successful components such as journaling and mentorship and the areas for improvement, specifically Adherence and Involvement. Furthermore, your results and discussion must transparently address the challenges of short program duration and provide exact recommendations, including the need for extended time and private reflection spaces. 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

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The abstract currently lacks the exact participant count and grade level, which are crucial for context. Please specify that the study explored the experiences of ten Grade 11 students. You also need to identify the exact location of the Catholic school to ground the demographic data. Add that the institution is located in Davao City. Additionally, ensure you explicitly list the exact activities that proved successful within the program. Mention that journaling, mentorship, and faith-sharing successfully strengthened the students' connection with God. These additions will ensure your summary provides a complete and accurate reflection of your empirical work.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This descriptive qualitative study offers valuable insights into the spiritual development of adolescents within a structured religious educational environment. The analysis of the FAITH intervention is insightful, but the manuscript needs more precise demographic details in the abstract to help readers immediately grasp the scope of the research. Providing specific examples of the most impactful program components will also strengthen the clarity of your core findings. These revisions will greatly enhance the readability of your publication.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</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.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
You must insert the exact names of the weak program parts in the abstract. Add Adherence and Involvement to clarify the less effective areas. Next, tell the readers the exact reasons for this issue. State that short durations and limited practical application caused the problem. Finally, write the exact suggestions for the future. Propose extended time and private reflection spaces for the students. Your paper will become excellent with these exact additions.

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The research on faith programs in a Catholic school is very informative. The current draft lacks specific facts about the less effective parts. People want to know the exact areas for improvement right away. Please add the details I mention below to finish the work.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</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.



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.			