



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Assessment of Technical Competencies and Professional Readiness Among BIT-FT Students Interns SY 2025-2026: Bridging the Gap Between Academe and Food Industry
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers recognize the value of your manuscript and recommend revisions to further enhance its clarity, organization, and overall quality.

In addition, you are required to conduct a thorough inventory of the references in your manuscript. Please ensure that only the sources cited within the text are included in the References section, and likewise, that all references listed in the References section are properly cited in the manuscript. For example, if you have 20 cited references in the manuscript, then only 20 references should be included in the References section. However, please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single entry in the References list; therefore, the total number of entries in the References section may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Furthermore, we have observed that most of the references are not available online. Kindly verify all references and ensure their accuracy. Please include a valid website link or DOI for each reference, and make sure that the reference details correspond correctly to the link or DOI provided. All references will be checked individually for verification.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

The paper compares students' self-ratings and supervisors' ratings, reports very large t-values and significant p-values, and then makes strong curricular conclusions such as a systemic perception gap, a curriculum that is more science-focused than technology-driven, and need for high-fidelity simulation. However, the methodological and statistical basis for these claims is still not strong enough in the present form. The study used only 25 student interns and 7 supervisors, yet the paper applies independent-samples t-tests and very strong interpretation without clearly explaining how supervisor ratings were matched or aggregated, whether assumptions for the test were checked, and why some statistical reporting is inconsistent. For example, the results tables present t-values, but the Discussion suddenly refers to a high F-value of 280.23, which was not reported in the results tables. Also, Table 6 has an incomplete overall mean, and the paper treats Likert means with very strong practical conclusions without



enough evidence for instrument reliability and validity. Because of this, the main argument of the paper is interesting and relevant, but the evidence chain is not yet fully convincing.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

My specific comment is that the authors need to strengthen the methodology-analysis link first before expanding the interpretation. Please clarify the unit of analysis and the comparison procedure between students and supervisors. If supervisors rated multiple interns, this creates possible non-independence, so the current t-test approach may not be the best or at least needs clearer justification. Please also report the reliability of the questionnaire for each domain, explain how the researcher-made tool was validated beyond saying it was checked by experts, and keep the statistical reporting fully consistent across Abstract, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. The discussion should also be toned down a little because the present data can support existence of rating differences, but not yet very strong claims about curriculum misalignment or the curriculum being more science-oriented than technology-driven. Once this core issue is fixed, the paper can become much stronger because the topic is timely, practical, and clearly important for internship and curriculum improvement.

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

General Comments and Recommendations

The paper tackles a very timely and relevant issue, especially given the continuous push for industry-academe linkage and quality assurance in our local HEIs. Assessing the technical and professional readiness of BIT-Food Technology interns against the backdrop of Industry 4.0 is a commendable effort that adds value to curriculum development. The manuscript generally flows well, and the identification of the perception gap between students and industry supervisors is a practical finding.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

In the Methodology section, you explicitly stated that the study employed a Descriptive-Quantitative Research Design. However, your Results section contains qualitative data addressing the primary challenges, unavailable tools, and curriculum improvement suggestions (Sections E, F, and G). If you are combining quantitative statistical impact with qualitative inquiry to get a deeper understanding of the gap, you need to formally declare and structure this as a Mixed-Methods research design. Furthermore, the qualitative responses are currently



just listed as broad statements. Please apply proper qualitative thematic analysis to these responses rather than just summarizing them in paragraph form.

The study also utilizes independent samples t-tests to compare the perceptions of the two groups. You are comparing a sample of 25 students against only 7 supervisors. While mathematically possible to run a t-test, claiming highly significant difference with a group size of 7 severely lacks statistical power and makes the findings highly vulnerable to outliers. Given the very small sample size of the supervisors, kindly consider using non-parametric alternatives (such as the Mann-Whitney U test) which are more robust for small, unequal sample sizes. At the very least, this severe limitation in the sample size must be heavily emphasized in the Discussion, as it weakens the generalizability of the findings.

In your conclusion, you stated that the analysis reveals that the BIT-Food Technology curriculum is now more science-focused than technology-driven. This is also echoed in the main conclusion section. This is a massive leap in logic. Your data only proves that supervisors rated the students as "Prepared" (mean = 3.69) instead of "Strongly Prepared". A rating of "Prepared" is still positive and does not empirically prove that the entire curriculum is "science-focused." Unless you conducted a document analysis of the actual syllabus or the CHED Memorandum Orders guiding the program to support this claim, you should remove this statement. Stick to what your data actually proves, that there is an operational autonomy and behavioral readiness gap.

Your methodology lists the 5-point scale simply as 5 = Strongly Prepared / Strongly Agree, down to 1. However, you did not provide the range of means (e.g., 4.50 - 5.00 = Strongly Prepared). Because the ranges are not defined, the interpretations in your tables are inconsistent. For example, in Table 4, a Grand Mean of 4.20 is interpreted as "Strongly Prepared", but in Table 7, a mean of 4.14 is "Agree" and 4.30 is "Strongly Agree". Please provide a clear table of the range of means in Chapter 2 and apply the verbal interpretations strictly and consistently across all your data tables.

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.			