



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Enhancing the Operationalization of ETEEAP through Philippine Embassies, OWWA and HEIs for Saudi-based Overseas Filipino Workers: Towards a Collaborative Facilitation Framework
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers recognize the value and potential contribution of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further strengthen its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall academic quality. Additionally, you are requested to carefully examine and verify all references cited in the manuscript. Please ensure that all references are accurate, valid, and accessible through Google Scholar to maintain the credibility and reliability of the study. Moreover, only sources that are cited within the text should be included in the References section, and all references listed must likewise appear in the in-text citations. For example, if there are 20 unique sources cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should appear in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source throughout the manuscript are considered a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be fewer than the total number of in-text citations. Furthermore, please make sure to provide the DOI or accessible link for all references included in the References section.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses an important and timely topic, especially because ETEEAP can be a meaningful pathway for OFWs who already have work experience but still need formal academic credentials. The focus on Saudi-based OFWs and the proposed collaboration among Philippine Embassy, OWWA, and HEIs is practical and relevant.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The major issue is the mismatch and lack of clarity in the mixed-methods design. In the abstract, the study is described as sequential exploratory, but in the methodology it is described as sequential explanatory. These two designs are different, so the author must clearly decide which design was actually used and revise the paper consistently. If the survey came first and FGDs were used to explain the survey results, then it is sequential explanatory. If the qualitative findings came first and were used to develop the survey or framework, then it is sequential exploratory. This needs to be corrected because it affects how the whole study is understood.



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.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript presents an important topic about OFWs in Saudi Arabia and their access to ETEEAP. The objective to formulate a collaborative facilitation framework is highly relevant.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The text mentions a proposed Collaborative Facilitation Framework that defines clear roles for embassies, OWWA, and HEIs. However, the author did not present the framework itself. Kindly insert a diagram or a detailed matrix to show exactly how these agencies will coordinate. The study feels incomplete without it.
The results rely only on descriptive statistics like frequencies and percentages to summarize operational challenges. To make the paper acceptable for a high impact science journal, please apply inferential statistics. You must establish significant relationships between variables or compare different demographic groups of OFWs.
The author states the study is a sequential explanatory mixed method design. Yet, the qualitative section is weak. The methodology mentions thematic analysis for the FGDs, but the results section does not present any direct quotes or deep qualitative themes from the 20 participants. Please provide actual narrative evidence from the OFWs to support your claims.
There is a major disconnect between the text citations and the reference list. The text cites De Guzman 2022, Senge 2006, Ansell and Gash 2008, and Smith and Betts 2021. None of these authors appear in the final reference section. Please review and correct all citations carefully.

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.
	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.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			