



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Effectiveness of a Web-Based Writing Intervention in Enhancing Elementary Students' Composition Skills: A Sequential Explanatory Mixed-Methods Study
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers note that the manuscript has merit but requires revisions to further strengthen its clarity, coherence, and academic quality. The authors are encouraged to carefully review and address all comments and recommendations provided by the reviewers in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

The manuscript explores a highly relevant topic, especially given the continuous push for digital integration in basic education in the Philippines. The author's attempt to use a mixed-methods approach to evaluate a web-based writing intervention is appreciated.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The study relies on a one-group pretest-posttest design. Without a control group, it is impossible to definitively attribute the improvements in writing scores solely to the web-based intervention, as other confounding variables cannot be ruled out. More critically, the intervention was implemented over a mere one-week period, specifically consisting of only three instructional sessions. Writing proficiency, particularly components like grammar and organizational coherence, is a complex cognitive skill that requires sustained practice. Claiming that a single week of digital instruction produced statistically significant, lasting improvements across all six writing domains is an overreach. The author must temper these claims and properly frame this as a preliminary or pilot observation.

There is a significant issue with the literature integration in the discussion section. The author repeatedly forces citations from a specific cluster of authors (Ersando, Po, etc.) that have little to no relevance to elementary composition writing. For example, the manuscript cites a paper on forecasting mathematics achievement using ARIMA to support claims about instructional strategy trends. It also cites a paper on reading comprehension and math problem-solving to justify findings on students' structural weaknesses in writing. Another cited paper focuses on integrating sustainable development into elementary mathematics to support claims about



instructional innovation. These citations must be thoroughly audited and removed unless a direct, logical connection to English composition writing can be robustly defended.
The paper notes an overall mean increase of +0.73. While the paired samples t-test shows this as statistically significant, the qualitative interpretation of the rubric scores seems exaggerated. For instance, the overall mean moved from 2.66 to 3.30, yet the qualitative interpretation jumped directly to excellent. The author needs to provide the actual scale or rubric parameters (e.g., 1.00-1.50 = Poor, etc.) in the Methodology section to justify why a 3.30 out of an undefined maximum score warrants an excellent rating.
The study utilizes a purposive sample of only 30 students from one intact class. While acceptable for localized action research, the conclusion asserts that the intervention produced statistically significant improvements and offers an evidence-based instructional framework. The author should explicitly state in the abstract and conclusion that these findings are highly localized and cannot be generalized across different educational contexts without further empirical testing.

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

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This paper presents a solid mixed-methods study on how a short web-based writing intervention can help Grade 6 pupils improve their composition skills in a regular classroom. I like the practical approach and the way you combine numbers with students' voices, it really shows effort to make the findings useful for teachers here in the Philippines. Overall the work has good potential to add value in the social sciences section of the Philippine Journal of Science because it uses clear data and real classroom setting. Still, a few major points need careful attention so the paper becomes stronger and more convincing.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
First, although five teachers scored the writings, there is no report on inter-rater reliability such as ICC or kappa value. Without this number readers cannot be sure the average scores are stable, especially since the rubric decides the whole results. Adding that statistic would make the quantitative part much more trustworthy. If not possible, acknowledge it as a limitation.
Second, Table 4 mentions the paired t-test but only says $p < .05$ and null rejected without showing the actual t-values, degrees of freedom, or exact p for each writing component or the overall score. The abstract gives one t-value but the body does not repeat or explain it fully. In



a scientific journal, readers expect the complete test output so they can check the strength of the improvement themselves.

Finally, the qualitative themes are listed nicely but without any student quotes or short examples from the focus groups. In sequential explanatory design the stories should really explain why the scores went up. Adding two or three short quotes would make the findings richer and more alive.

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.			