



Peer Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Making Room for the Filipino Nones: An Exposition of Its Theological and Ecclesiological Mandate from the Lens of Christus Vivit
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. 1. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. 2. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference whenever available to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. 3. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. 4. Please also note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses a timely and relevant issue, especially in the context of Filipino youth, religious disaffiliation, and the pastoral response of the Catholic Church. 1. The topic has value, but the paper still needs stronger scholarly discipline because some parts read more like a pastoral reflection than a research article.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
2. The study needs a clearer and more focused research argument. At present, the paper discusses many ideas such as Filipino Nones, reflexive spirituality, spiritual bricolage, pilgrimage, and accompaniment, but the central contribution is not always easy to follow. The author should make clearer what is new in the paper and how this differs from existing theological or pastoral discussions.



- | |
|---|
| 3. The methodology needs to be strengthened. The paper says it used document review, exegesis, and hermeneutics, but the actual process of selecting, analyzing, and interpreting the documents is still general. A stronger explanation is needed so readers can understand how the findings and framework were developed. |
| 4. The Results section should be revised. Some parts are written in a personal and reflective tone, including the researcher's own realizations. This may be meaningful, but for a journal, the results should be more analytical and directly connected to the research objectives. |
| 5. The proposed heuristic framework is useful, but it needs more explanation and justification. The paper should show more clearly how each part of the framework was derived from Christus Vivit and from the literature on Filipino Nones. This will make the framework more credible and not just descriptive. |

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>
6. The author did a good job formulating the heuristic framework. However, if we want this to meet the rigorous standards of an international journal, there are major structural and methodological gaps that need to be addressed. The paper currently reads more like a theological reflection or a thesis chapter rather than a critical journal article. The biggest issue is the mismatch between the stated methodology and the actual results presented. We need to help the author align these parts so the paper becomes solid and publishable.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
7. The methodology states that the study employs a document review as the primary method, specifically looking into Christus Vivit using historical background, exegesis, and hermeneutics. However, the Results section explicitly presents the "three defining characteristics that make a Filipino None" as the actual "findings of this study". This is a major flaw because the author did not conduct empirical sociological research to find these characteristics; rather, they borrowed these concepts from existing literature, such as Jayeel Cornelio's work on reflexive spirituality and Claude Lévi-Strauss's concept of bricolage.
8. A large part of the "Discussion" section (Section 4) reads exactly like a Literature Review. For example, the deep dives into the definitions of Reflexive Spirituality, Spiritual Bricolage, and Pilgrim-Seeker, including references to Pew Research Center, Robert C. Fuller, and Elizabeth Drescher, are presenting background information rather than discussing new findings.
9. The writing sometimes shifts from an academic tone into a personal or homiletic reflection. Phrases like "The researcher has felt his own assumptions shift" and "The researcher has convicted that the Church's future in the Philippines lies not in preserving the status quo..." are



a bit too subjective for a research journal. While the Acknowledgments beautifully include "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam!", the main text must maintain critical academic distance.

10. The paper proposes a heuristic framework as an output. While Figure 2 looks great, the paper lacks a clear step-by-step explanation of how the exegesis of Christus Vivit generated the specific elements on the left side of the diagram (Inclusivity, Belongingness, Self-Critique, Daring).

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.			